DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 646 EA 020 320

AUTHOR Clark, Richard W.
TITLE School/University Relations: Partnerships and Networks. Occasional Paper No. 2.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Educational Renewal.
PUB DATE Aug 86
NOTE 148p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publication Sales, Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195 ($3.50 prepaid).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; Coordination; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Networks

ABSTRACT

This occasional paper provides a comprehensive review of literature pertaining to one of the major activities of the Center for Educational Renewal: the establishment of school-university partnerships for mutual improvement and the creation of a national network for purposes of supporting and communicating among the partnerships. After a brief introduction, the second section reviews the literature that defines key terms used throughout the monograph: networks, collaboratives, cooperatives, partnerships, and other terminology. Section 3 provides a historical perspective on school-university collaboration, while section 4 examines contemporary examples. Section 5, "The Whys, Wherefores, and Whatnots of Collaboration," examines the reasons individuals and organizations offer for seeking collaborative arrangements, and considers the benefits claimed for such efforts. It then reviews the obstacles reported as creating difficulties for those who seek success through collaboration, and concludes with a set of suggestions for making collaboration succeed. The final section examines implications for study and action. A selective annotated bibliography is appended, followed by a standard comprehensive bibliography. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298646

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

[X] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Goodlad

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Center for Educational Renewal

SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY RELATIONS:
PARTNERSHIPS AND NETWORKS

RICHARD W. CLARK

Occasional Paper No. 2

August 1986

OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy
College of Education
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

EA 020 320

SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY RELATIONS: PARTNERSHIPS AND NETWORKS

RICHARD W. CLARK

Occasional Paper No. 2

August 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE BY JOHN I. GOODLAD i

I. INTRODUCTION. 1

II. SOME DEFINITIONS. 4

III. HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY COLLABORATION 24

IV. EXAMINATION OF CONTEMPORARY EXAMPLES OF SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY COLLABORATION 42

V. THE WHYS, WHEREFORES, AND WHATNOTS OF COLLABORATION 74

VI. IMPLICATIONS FOR STUDY AND ACTION 101

APPENDIX A: ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY A-1

APPENDIX B: BIBLIOGRAPHY B-1

Table 1: Corresponding Benefits to Schools, Universities, and Individuals Participating in Collaborative Research 77

Table 2: Relationship Between Types of Innovation and Purpose of Networks 81

Preface

"School/University Relations: Partnerships and Networks" is Number 2 in the Occasional Paper Series of the Center for Educational Research, a unit of the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy. The institute, in turn, is a major research and development entity of the College of Education, University of Washington. The center, and the institute of which it is a part, are committed to forging new linkages for the simultaneous improvement of both schooling and the research and educational programs of higher education that purport to relate to schooling.

A guiding assumption of the center's work is that the improvement of schooling and of the education of educators go hand-in-hand. We will not get better schools until we get more able people to staff them; but we will not get more able people until the circumstances of the workplace and of preparing people for it are improved. And so, improving schools and the education of teachers must proceed simultaneously.

Consequently, my colleagues and I have embarked upon three interrelated activities: (1) a study of the conditions and circumstances surrounding the education of educators, (2) an inquiry into policies and practices in other professions to determine the lessons that might apply to education, and (3) the establishment of school/university partnerships for mutual improvement and the creation of a national network for purposes of supporting and communicating among the partnerships. The Occasional Paper Series is designed to report on aspects of this work as it progresses. The four papers produced or targeted for production in 1986 cover all three of the center's activities. This one is addressed to the third.

As succeeding pages reveal, there is a substantial body of literature on networks and a variety of other collaborations such as partnerships. The center commissioned Richard W. Clark, Deputy Superintendent of the Bellevue (Washington) School District, to review and analyze the most significant publications and to report, where possible, on illustrative programs and projects. Patricia A. Hammill was appointed to assist him.

One of Clark's most seminal conclusions, of great relevance to our work, is that there have been few instances of universities and schools or school districts collaborating as equal partners on problems representing the substantial overlapping of self-interests. Further, Clark reports the doubts of several students of the subject as to whether such collaborations are possible. Since the need for them is one of our working assumptions, this conclusion is both sobering and challenging.

In the first chapter of a book on school/university relations, edited by Bernard Gifford (Teachers College, in press), I endeavor to recount the evolution in my mind of the partnership concept and the experiences over several decades that fostered it. These experiences--predominantly research oriented in one cycle and predominantly experience oriented in the next--led to the decision to seek deliberately the formation of close linkages among school districts and between school districts and universities. Some of what I believe to be the necessary conditions for a successful, symbiotic relationship to be formed are set forth in Occasional Paper No. 1, Center for Educational Renewal.

The chapter in the Gifford book describes early efforts to create these conditions in three rather different school/university partnerships in

California, Utah, and Washington. The problems and difficulties arising to date are, for the most part, those documented by Clark in his comprehensive review of the literature. He refers to the shortage of boundary spanners --persons who can move back and forth between the schools and the university and who have an understanding of both cultures; to the role of the university in studying education and to the utility of the research for the practitioner; to the kinds of problems most amenable to school/university collaboration; to the reward structure; and to the questions of whether these two cultures can work effectively together. He wonders if we may find ourselves watching two dinosaurs circling each other, while other entities emerge as the providers of education and the trainers of those who educate.

Clark's concluding paragraphs are written in an appropriate vein that is at once both optimistic and cautious. He comes down hard on the necessity for selfless commitment by all parties.

At the time of this writing, the National Network for Educational Renewal comprises a dozen school/university partnerships in a dozen states: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Hawaii, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming. Negotiations with two others are nearing closure. We regard the whole as a social experiment at the core of which is an idea whose time is come. Whether the returns will be worth the effort remains to be seen; this equation is the subject of intensive inquiry. It is, however, difficult to believe that the coming together of these differing but complementary cultures will have more negative than positive consequences.

We are grateful to Dick Clark and Patricia Hammill for their selective review of a vast body of varied documents pertaining to networks, partnerships, and other collaborations. Perhaps the most significant contribution of this paper is the centrality of attention to school/university linkages designed to improve both sets of institutions and what such linkages appear to require for success.

John I. Goodlad

Professor and Director

Center for Educational Renewal

SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY RELATIONS: PARTNERSHIPS & NETWORKS

I. INTRODUCTION

The average person who is not part of the public schools or the various institutions of higher education in this country probably has the common-sense point of view that these organizations are in the same business--education, and assumes that they work together to achieve complementary if not identical goals. They would undoubtedly be surprised if told that, in reality, these are very different kinds of organizations with cultures so different that professionals working within them have difficulty understanding one another's needs and values. Since all professionals in schools and universities have at one time or another been active participants in pre-collegiate education--as students if not as faculty or administration--it is even more surprising that these people have a lack of knowledge of each other's culture and a lack of awareness of how they can work together to achieve more than can be accomplished by working separately. In spite of common sense points of view and lack of knowledge about each other's institutions, collaboration among school and university personnel is now one of the most frequently touted approaches to the reform of education.

Recently, John Goodlad completed his extensive "Study of Schooling" reporting on results of in-depth investigations in more than 1,000 classrooms and interviews of 1,350 teachers, 8,624 parents, and 17,163 students in A Place Called School (1984). In that work he described actions needed

to reform schools, and called for the creation of a national network of local school/university partnerships. After describing "The Partnership" he had initiated with surrounding school districts while he was dean at UCLA, Goodlad went on to say that:

> Needed is a critical mass large enough to make a visible difference--a really sizable network of partnerships, if you will. Each partnership must be small enough to be conceptually and logistically manageable and large enough to include the essential components of the community arena--but no more. The network to which the partnerships belong must be a binding, communicating one sharing a reasonably common agenda. (1984, 356)

Goodlad invited thirty-two educators representing higher education, public schools, state departments, the federal government, and interested private foundations to a work conference in Chicago on August 2, 1985. Among the issues considered at this conference was "linkage of 8-12 school/university partnerships, each with a focus on simultaneous reconstruction of preparation and practice, and each with a small agenda of areas where self-interests overlap." (1985a, 2)

At this conference, he elaborated on his concept of partnerships, emphasizing that:

> . . . successful partnerships have at least three essential characteristics: a degree of dissimilarity between or among the partners; the mutual satisfaction of self-interests; a measure of selflessness on the part of each sufficient to assure this satisfaction of self-interests by all involved. (1985b, 1)

As he described the relationships he intended, Goodlad stressed that he was arguing for a "symbiotic" relationship between schools and universities

for purposes of simultaneously improving schools and the education of educators.

During the ensuing discussion, Gary Sykes of Stanford raised the question of whether this effort to create a network of partnerships was proceeding with full recognition of the substantial body of literature that exists concerning networks and other types of school/university relationships. In response, this monograph was commissioned to serve as a resource for those actively engaged in creating and operating the various partnerships and the national network. There are many articles, books, and other documents on the subject of school/university relationships, and the number is growing. It would be presumptuous, therefore, to suggest that this report summarizes the findings of all studies. It does, however, represent the results of an extensive review of the literature on the subject and provides bibliographic information for those who wish to explore the subject in more depth.

II. SOME DEFINITIONS

One of the complications of investigating this subject is that different terms are used to describe similar activities and, on the other hand, different meanings are attached to the same term. Authors speak of partnerships, collaborations, consortiums, networks, clusters, interorganizational agreements (IOAs), collectives, and cooperatives, frequently without definition and often without distinguishing their chosen descriptor from other possible terms. In fact, these are different kinds of relationships and, at least to some extent, it is important to define them before attempting to discuss school/college relationships.

Networks

Of the various terms used, network represents the most complex concept and has the greatest record of scholarly investigation. Sarason et al. (1977) observe that:

> The word network has been used in more than a dozen fields, including sociology, anthropology, psychiatry, psychology, administrative sciences, geography, city planning, and communications engineering. Although there is little cross-indexing among fields, network has surprisingly similar but not identical meanings across these disciplines, each discipline emphasizing different points, and certainly various disciplines studying dissimilar phenomena. Most usages are not mutually exclusive and reflect the same underlying idea, that is, that each person or organization has a wide array of interrelationships, the bases of which can vary in the extreme. (p. 126)

While relying primarily on material from administrative sciences and

sociology, this review has examined some materials from all of the above mentioned fields.

Historically, Jacob Moreno (1934) provided basic methodological tools for analyzing networks as he developed sociograms to provide graphic representations of social relationships among individuals. Sociology has continued to focus on the study of such relationships, expanding the size of the networks and the sophistication of tools used for the study. Role theory, exchange theory, and structural-functional theory have all contributed to this development of sophisticated methodology (Smith 1983). Networks became the focus of such studies with the publication of Katz and Lazarfield's Personal Influence in 1955, and with work by Coleman, Katz, and Menzels (Sarason 1977, 158-159), and by Homans which focused on dyads for communication. Such studies have expanded so that now relationships are mapped not only between individuals and pairs of individuals, but between groups and organizations.

In 1975, Miles and Lake offered a preliminary definition of network that clearly reflects the diverse origins of the concept:

> Most basically, we consider a network to be a dispersed arrangement of elements (or nodes) connected to each other by "lines." Material, energy or information can travel between nodes along the lines. Some of the elements . . . have more lines connecting to other elements. (p. 2)

Later Miles (1977) refined his definition stating, that:

> At the most abstract, a network is simply a set of nodes or points connected by lines or links. There is often the implication that various things (such as messages, objects, energy, etc.) travel

> along the lines, which thus serve as channels. . . . In social networks the nodes are persons, groups or organizations. The things which travel between the nodes are socially relevant . . . objects, labor, affect, evaluation, knowledge, prescription/opinion, influence and power. So a network is a connected set of social actors exchanging socially relevant material. (p. 2)

Lortie (1977) suggests that when:

> sociologists and other social scientists study networks, they are examining the composite activities of individual scientists, job seekers, underworld figures, migrants, etc., as they go about their daily concerns; the patterns of interactions developed by such persons can be conceptualized as social circles or networks, and analysis is revealing that they have particular properties which set them apart. (p. 8)

Parker--who reported on the study of 29 networks for a paper presented at an NIE conference in 1977--observed that there are many types of social networks. By way of example, he mentioned kinship, diffusion, natural helping, person-to-person, and informal establishment cliques (otherwise known as "old-boy" networks). His particular focus (and our particular interest) was on problem-solving and innovation networks. These he defined as networks that:

> facilitate the sharing of information and psychological support among independent innovators and problem solvers who link together voluntarily as equals seeking assistance not provided by established systems. (p. 25)

Schon (1977) defined informal social networks as follows:

> patterns of relationship and interaction among persons or collectivities. These patterns are regular and persistent and, in that sense, law-like, but they are not governed by formal rules. They lie outside the boundaries of formal contract, formal regulation, formal organization. (p. 3)

The contrasting of networks with formal organizations is a major theme that will be commented on further; but first, to gain a better understanding of the breadth of the concept of informal social networks, consider the typology Schon (1977) identified:

Helping Networks.

- A. Irregular economies
- B. Coping networks.
- C. Support systems.
- D. Practitioner/client networks
- E. Self-help networks.

II. Organizational ecologies.

- A. Functional ecologies
- B. Community networks.

III. Secondary networks.

- A. Movement networks. [related to particular ideology]
- B. Invisible colleges.
- C. Practitioner networks.
- D. Program networks. (p. 11)

Smith's (1977) definition of network introduces the notion of spatial separation and again raises the question of the difference between networks and formal organizations:

> a network is an interrelated set of members separated in space so that direct face to face interactions tend to be sporadic or episodic rather than regular or frequent. As such a network can be roughly distinguished from a group . . . a network tends to be more diffuse, less hierarchical, and less goal centered than a formal organization. (p. 4)

Writing from the perspective of a political scientist, Peterson (1977) takes exception to Smith's differentiation of networks from groups, as he says that:

> to understand the significance and implications of social networks, one must appreciate how closely this concept in contemporary writing approximates the social group, as understood by Dewey, Bentley, Mead and the progressive/pluralist tradition more generally. (p. 4)

The spatial dispersion of members of a network is also present in Huberman's (in Devaney 1982) overview of the concept:

> Network theorists . . . usually talk about interrelated sets of members who are separated organizationally or geographically so that direct, face-to-face interactions tend to be sporadic or episodic. And networks are typically made up of "homophiles," people who share a common background, common experiences and common understandings or convictions. (Devaney, p. 91)

Parker (1977), Huberman (1982), Schon (1977), Lortie (1977), and Sarason (1977) are among those who emphasize the difference between networks and formal organizations. Generally, these authors emphasize that networks are alternatives to established systems. Lortie goes so far as to express doubt that networks can be artificially created because, as he notes:

> Informal networks grow out of the decisions and behaviors of hundreds and thousands of persons--they have a spontaneous, unconstructed quality, or, at least, a limited degree of intentionality. [He goes on to say that] I personally find it hard to see how anyone, acting from the outside, can create such systems, but it may be possible. (p. 9)

Huberman (1982) and others discuss the way networks are used by their members to bypass formal institutional channels in order to better cope with day-to-day problems. Scholars analyze diagrams describing the network of communications within a formal organization (e.g., Smith 1983). Parker

(1977) distinguishes networks from formal organizations as he notes that if a network stops meeting participants' needs, it disintegrates or becomes latent (p. 16). He also attempts to define a difference between informal organizations and networks by suggesting that informal organizations are something that are found within an organization and networks cross organizational boundaries. However, that distinction does not seem to hold in most of the literature, as networks are as apt to be discussed within the framework of an organization as between organizations. Moreover, it is important to note that most of the literature examining application of network theory to the change process in education, assumes that networks are external to the establishment, not a part of an organization.

While distinctions are made between networks and formal organizations, there are other classification schemes employed. Frequently, attention is given to whether a network is natural or deliberately stimulated. Again, terminology is not consistent with some authors speaking of spontaneous or initiated networks, while others (Peterson 1977) call them emergent or constituted. Whatever terminology is used, the characteristic of networks being addressed is clear. One of the issues raised is whether constituted networks are really different from organizations--whether they retain the same qualities that are described by those who have studied emergent or natural networks.

One way various people have attempted to further characterize networks is to describe commonalities. Parker (1977) has suggested that all problem-solving and innovation networks include certain common ingredients:

1. a sense of being an alternative to established systems

2. a feeling of shared purpose

3. a mixture of information sharing and psychological support

4. a person functioning as an effective facilitator

5. an emphasis on voluntary participation and equal treatment. (p. 10)

Schön (1977) was not ready to claim that his characteristics could be found in all networks, but he suggested that the following were important features shared among many networks:

1. Boundaries are fuzzy and shifting.

2. There is often no clear center or locus of leadership.

3. Networks are dynamic.

4. Networks are apt to have multiple functions--may serve as vehicles for exchange, for mutual support, for status and evaluation. . . . Often they are able to serve one function because they serve others.

5. Informal networks may have multiple relations to formal institutions.

6. Networks depend on persons who play "network roles." Among these roles are brokerage, referral, mediation, diffusion, facilitation, evaluation. (p. 6)

7. Networks depend upon slack. Without the free resources for exchange, the free time for involvement, the functioning of networks would become impossible. (p. 6) In return networks may serve to create slack; they may create time and capital.

8. Networks have life cycles.

9. Some networks are central to the meanings persons find or create in their lives.

[Many of these qualities] have the effect of making them [networks] difficult or impossible, through formal institutional means, to control, create or support. (p. 7)

Sarason (1977) notes that there is a number of different emphases in meanings of the word network, but claims that there are two primary commonalities in the use of the term:

> (1) the recognition that various aspects of social life and functioning are increasingly becoming complexly interrelated; and
>
> (2) the belief that the development of conceptualizations and descriptive analyses based on the basic structural interrelationships (networks) among individuals or organizations can provide distinctive insight into contemporary interrelatedness. (pp. 126-127)

He defines a network as:

> a structural entity that centers around a specified focal point (for example, individual, family, organization) and includes those units with which the focal unit has direct and indirect interrelationships. (p. 151)

Sarason suggests that there are three "distinctive attributes" of networks:

> (1) every unit in a network does not interact with every other unit in a network;
>
> (2) the units in a single network do not have a clear boundary from the rest of the world; and
>
> (3) the only common characteristic of units in a network is their relationship (direct or indirect) to the ego [the center of the network]. (p. 128]

In identifying these attributes, he is obviously supporting those who suggest that a characteristic of networks is separation of major units; however, his notion that the only commonality is the link to the ego--while quite possibly accurate--flies in the face of others' claims of long lists

of commonalities by which networks can be defined. It also limits the concept to one kind of network; other types of networks, as he acknowledges, may not have a central node serving as ego for the network.

Other authors have composed lists of commonalities and offered definitions; but while there are similarities and linkages in the ways in which the term networks is used, it should be obvious by now that even when authors stop to define the term, they fail to agree on it. This lack of agreement is compounded by the heavy contemporary use of networking as a verb describing ways that individuals gain power and advancement. The Yuppie propensity for networking has been the target of many satirical pieces, one of the more clever of which is More Fun With Dick and Jane (Gallant, 1986), which concludes with Jane telling her friends at a cocktail party that she needs to go "network." Within the field of education, informal networking has had a long history of significant impact. In fact, as will be discussed later in reviewing the history of school/university relationships, it may have had more influence on the development of the current system of schooling than any of the constituted networks spawned by federal agencies or colleges in recent years.

The difficulty created by this usage of the term is that attempts to analyze networks are undertaken by individuals who may think a network is something radically different from the view held by the research. This confusion is expanded as individuals and groups apply the term to established organizations as in The Network, operating in New England as an educational holding company for a variety of research and collaborative

efforts; or when the term is coopted by the federal government to describe a top-down diffusion process. Further confusion reigns when researchers speak of networks interchangeably with collaboratives, as in the Huberman (1981) "Midwestern State Teacher Center Network Case" where:

> The original proposal called for a network of centers spanning the state, each acting as a local switchboard that connected teachers with available sources of information and expertise found either at the local state college or university. (p. 12)

As the case study unfolds, Huberman points out that "the chief task of the statewide network consisted in consolidating the four local centers and putting into place a complex governance system" (p. 13)--a notion that seems more in keeping with the creation of a new bureaucracy than the creation of a network. Then the study informs us that this is one of three major cases prepared to provide understanding of university/school collaboration, and all of the cases rely on conceptual schema drawn from the knowledge of interorganizational networks within the field of interorganizational theory and on an understanding of knowledge transfer theory.

Huberman's work has been some of the most thorough and helpful in the field, and the above example is not cited to be critical of that work but to show the difficulty that is presented by the way various practitioners (for it was a practitioner and not the researcher who named the state organization a network) use the term. This linking of collaboration and network also provides a good transition for considering some of the terms other than network that have been used to describe school/university relationships.

Collaboratives, Cooperatives, Partnerships, and Other Terminology

There has been much written, particularly in recent years, about school/university relationships, described variously as collaborations or partnerships. Much of this material consists of brief descriptions of individual arrangements, generally by one of the key participants in the relationship. While there is often an effort to offer generalizations about such relationships, there is much less serious scholarship and therefore less theoretical framework for considering them. That is not to say that there are not a number of theoretical constructs in sociology, organization theory, and other fields that may be relevant; but to suggest that most of the people writing on the subject have not given much attention to these constructs. One exception to this is work done by Shirley Hord (1986), who for several years has focused not only on school/university relations, but on trying to categorize different kinds of relationships. In a 1978 work, quoted again in her most recent article, she defined collaboration as "a term that implies the parties involved share responsibility and authority for basic policy decision making." She suggests that cooperation, on the other hand, is "a term that assumes two or more parties, each with separate and autonomous programs, agree to work together in making all such programs more successful" (p. 22).

Hord (1986) compares these definitions with the following, which were developed by the New England Program in Teacher Education in 1973:

> Collaboration--development of the model of joint planning, joint implementation, and joint evaluation between individuals or organizations.
>
> Cooperation--two individuals or organizations reach some mutual agreement but their work together does not progress beyond this level. (p. 22)

An essential point of difference often appears to be the extent to which the relating agencies function as equals, and in so doing are willing to give up some of their autonomy. As will be noted numerous times in this monograph, that issue has been, and continues to be, central to the entire question of school/university relationships.

Gehrke and Parker (1983) speak to the looseness with which such terms have been used, then identify two types of collaboration:

> The literature implies that collaboration should involve pure collective initiation, planning, and implementation, and that all parties should have similar roles and responsibilities in all facets of the change. This model of collaboration could be called egalitarian. Its distinguishing characteristic is parity. . . . Collaborative planning can appear in yet another form that we call dialectical collaboration. It is distinguished by an integration of the top down, grass roots, and joint planning modes. (pp. 50-51)

For these authors, each model has its own utility depending on the situation. Thus, they reject as common a notion that many others support--the need for all partners in a collaboration to be equal in all ways--providing, instead, alternatives that should be deployed according to the subjective needs of the partners.

Hord notes that Thompson (1967) describes three types of strategies that organizations might use to manage their interdependence with other

organizations: (1) contracting, (2) coopting, and (3) coalescing. Later in the same text, Thompson speaks of the different ways in which interdependent parts of an organization can be related, identifying (1) pooled interdependence, (2) sequential interdependence, and (3) reciprocal interdependence (p. 54).

This latter typology may be helpful in categorizing different kinds of school/university relationships as well. In a pooled relationship, each organization--school or university--would make its unique contribution to the whole of educating our citizenry, but would do so in a relatively independent manner, being concerned at the most with sufficient standardization of activities to allow each to complete its task. Historically, as will be noted in more detail later, much of the effort toward school/university relations has been devoted to facilitating their sequential interdependence. That is, to assuring that the entrance requirements of the colleges are clearly enough specified that elementary and high schools can keep the sequence moving productively forward. Reciprocal interdependencies are those situations in which the outputs of each (department and organization) become the inputs for the others. Much of the historical relating between schools and universities appears to have been based on the premise that their interdependence (if indeed there were any) was pooled or sequential. However, reflection suggests that they constitute a sound example of a reciprocal relationship and that the strategies that are appropriate for such relationships should be employed.

As Thompson notes, standardization can provide for coordination of

pooled interdependence and planning can suffice to coordinate sequential relations, but mutual adjustment is essential for situations of reciprocal interdependence. Thompson goes on to point out that:

> Coordination by mutual adjustment is more costly, involving greater decision and communication burdens, than coordination by plan, which in turn is more costly than coordination by standardization. (p. 57)

Since organizations seek to minimize coordination costs, he suggests they will seek to group their internal organizations in such a way as to reduce the need for mutual adjustment. Again, examination of the historical relationships between schools and universities supports the notion that they have tried to avoid (or at least have ignored) the fact that they are reciprocally interdependent--which has reduced coordinating costs, but has not necessarily helped them achieve their overall goals which really require them to coordinate through mutual adjustment.

As different authors describe partnerships and consortiums involving schools and universities, they speak of the need for the relationship to be one of equality; but the historical record disputes their rhetoric. In an effort to define what he means by a partnership, John Goodlad (1985b and elsewhere) has frequently spoken of the need for that relationship to be a symbiotic one. In general usage, as defined by the dictionary and by many biologists, such a relationship would be one in which the mutual interests of the two parties were equally well served. However, Kormandy and Essenfeld (1984) provide a conceptualization of symbiosis that has interesting heuristic possibilities:

> Close Interactions. The relationship between two kinds of organisms that interact closely and repeatedly with each other is called symbiosis. In some types of symbiosis both members in the relationship benefit. Such is the case in the symbiosis between bees and many kinds of flowers. The bees obtain food (nectar and pollen) from the flowers. The flowers get their pollen spread to other flowers, a process that aids reproduction.
>
> In other types of symbiosis, only one member benefits. Organisms called parasites obtain food directly from the live organism in or on which they live (their hosts). In this case only the parasite benefits; the host is harmed in the process.
>
> Another type of symbiosis is competition. Organisms compete for food, space, shelter, and other resources. In certain cases of competition the competitors fight and the winner gets the resources. In most cases of competition no fighting occurs. For instance, forest trees compete for sunlight by growing taller. (p. 23)

Following this conceptualization of symbiosis, most of the consortiums, partnerships, and cooperatives described in the literature could be labeled as symbiotic even if most were parasitical or competitive in their relationship. However, few have attained the symbiotic state known as mutualism envisioned by Goodlad.

Hord (1986) reports that the North Carolina Quality Assurance Program is a collaborative effort of colleges and public schools that defines collaboration as:

> shared decision-making in governance, planning, delivery, and evaluation of programs. It is a pluralistic form of education where people of dissimilar backgrounds work together with equal status. It may be seen as working with rather than working on a person. (p. 24)

Trubowitz et al. (1984) also emphasize working with schools rather than on them as they describe the collaboration between Queens College and Louis

Armstrong Middle School in their book When a College Works with a Public School. But Goodlad's symbiotic mutualism is more than working with; it is working with in order to satisfy the mutual self-interests of the two (or more) agencies involved. It is not enough that the agencies are equal in the relationship--they need to be mutually benefiting each other.

Whether or not there is mutual adjustment in the coordination of school/university relations, or there is mutualism in the extent to which the relationship is beneficial to both schools and universities, there clearly are close and frequently repeated interactions. Moreover, there is ample evidence that most institutions of higher education have tried something that they have called collaboration or partnership with schools within the past twenty years--particularly since the rash of national criticism of common schools and the problems of tax support have manifested themselves for both schools and higher education. Perhaps partially because of the large number of such arrangements, it is virtually impossible to tell from the name given a particular relationship what its characteristics are. Although many have offered suggestions as to what should characterize these relationships, one finds the same characteristics urged for those known as collaborations, consortiums, partnerships, etc.

One problem with terminology in these relationships has been the adoption by other interests of the notion of partnerships. David Seeley (1981, 1984), Carl Marburger (1985), and others have used partnership as a descriptor for the relationship between parents and teachers which they advocate as a means of bypassing the central bureaucracy in efforts to

reform schools. Indeed, the National Committee for Citizens in Education with which Marburger and Seeley have both been associated, adds its own confusion to the picture by distributing its newsletter, The Network, and reporting on other efforts such as the Public Education Information Network at Washington University, St. Louis, which has been formed to establish communication links and "encourage collaborative efforts among local people, both professionals and laypersons, on behalf of public schools" (p. 6). Furthermore, the past five years have witnessed frequent use of "partnerships in education" as a means of identifying relationships between schools and business in adopt-a-school and other corporate support programs.

Now, there is nothing improper or harmful about a variety of groups seeking to improve schools, and there is certainly room for competing ideology concerning how that should be done; but the continued use by these differing groups of similar descriptors for different activities makes it difficult to achieve enough precision in terminology to build a clear typology of school/university relationships.

So, where does all this lead? What generalizations can be made about the meaning of various terms used to describe relationships?

First, and perhaps most obvious, individuals who seek to understand this topic, to learn from the writings of others about these relationships, must not be lulled into the belief that they are studying the same thing just because it has the same name as another relationship they had just

studied. Or, put another way, one person's partnership is another's network, is another's consortium. While it may be possible to say a rose is a rose is a rose, one cannot conclude that a partnership is a partnership is a partnership. As different relations are examined, it will be necessary to consider each as to how it is defined, not to rely on its title for clues to its make-up or operation.

Second, the term network is more apt to be used to describe relations between similar individuals, groups, or organizations. Partnership or consortium may describe relations between dissimilar entities--but not always. Networks are essentially anti-establishment. When networks become formalized, the line between a network and an organization becomes very blurred; therefore, those constituting networks need to beware of overly specifying governance, unless they seek the benefits of a formal organization instead of those attributable to a social network.

Third, examination of the varied ways these relationships are described should lead one to recognize that these are value-free concepts. Turk (1970) has emphasized this point, and it seems worth emphasizing here. Networks can be used for "good" and "bad" purposes. People may collaborate to produce change or to resist it.

Fourth, since there is particularly little agreement on the meaning of "partnership," it is necessary to examine in some depth the concept Goodlad has identified, which is the starting point for this project, so that other relations can be contrasted with that view. That is the end toward which

attention is next given, with particular reliance being placed on a recent manuscript by Goodlad (1985b). Note that his concept is not "value-free."

Recall that Goodlad (1985b) identifies three basic characteristics for partnerships:

> (1) The partners need to have a degree of dissimilarity,
>
> (2) The goal should be mutual satisfaction of self-interests,
>
> (3) Each party must be selfless enough to assure the satisfaction of these self interests. (p. 1)

He suggests that school/university partnerships can meet these three tests if they begin with a recognition that the responsibilities of these two institutions for the quality of schooling are "virtually inseparable" (p. 5). To demonstrate this point, he reminds us of the report from A Study of Schooling that the range of pedagogical methods is exceedingly narrow, with teachers generally using the methods that had been used on them as students. Specifically he says:

> The argument for school-university partnerships proceeds somewhat as follows. For schools to get better, they must have better teachers, among other things. To prepare better teachers (and counselors, special educators and administrators), universities must have access to schools using the best practices. To have the best practices, schools need access to new ideas and knowledge. This means that universities have a stake in school improvement just as schools have a stake in the education of teachers. (p. 6)

Such a view is clearly consistent with the notion of Thompson concerning reciprocal interdependence; and therefore it is not surprising that Goodlad, as did Thompson (1967), emphasizes the complexity of the effort to

provide coordination for such a partnership. He points out that "the rather casual rotation of management responsibilities among members will not suffice for active partnerships" (Goodlad 1985b, pp. 3-4) even if it might work for networks. He identifies other ways in which such partnerships must differ from networks listing (1) purposes, (2) structure, (3) ambience, and (4) evaluation, as well as staff.

Partnerships such as those Goodlad describes are not easy to locate. In the following discussion of school/university collaboration--historical and contemporary--the reader should keep this concept of partnership in mind. There are many instances of collaboration, but there are few, if any, examples of symbiotic relationships that meet the tests established by Goodlad for those he contends can make a difference.

At the same time, it is necessary to remember that the network that Goodlad has created is not a "partnership" but a linking of partnerships in a binding relationship that facilitates communications about a common agenda of school renewal.

III. HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY COLLABORATION

Early Collaboration

One of the earliest and best known efforts at school/university collaboration was initiated in the late nineteenth century. At the meeting of the National Council of Education in 1891, James Baker, Denver High School principal, presented a committee report on the general subjects of uniformity in school programs and requirements for college admissions. This report was followed by more committee action under the chairmanship of Charles Eliot, Harvard president. This committee, known as the committee of ten, issued its recommendations in 1892 and included among them a call for:

> . . . a conference of school and college teachers of each principal subject which enters into the programmes of secondary schools . . . to consider the limits of its subject, the best methods of instruction, the most desirable allocation of time for the subject, and the best methods of testing the pupils' attainment therein. . . . (in Cohen, p. 1974, p. 1931)

The conferences were convened and included 47 individuals from colleges and universities and 42 school people. Their recommendations spoke to the need for an earlier introduction of basic elements of all the disciplines, interdisciplinary instruction, emphasis on study skills and critical thinking, upgrading of grammar school studies, and uniformity of teaching for all students--college bound or not. In addition, they called for improvement of teacher preparation for both elementary and secondary

superior expertise on the part of college personnel. This led to direct conflict with the schools. In 1934 the board acknowledged that it "should be ready to cooperate with the secondary schools and colleges in this period of important change in secondary school work" (Fuess, p. 114).

However, division among the ranks and mistrust continued and what had begun as a collaborative venture between the colleges and secondary schools became a battle between the new experts in psychological testing and those devoted to more traditional methods of achievement testing.

In April of 1930, 200 men and women met in the nation's capital to consider ways that secondary schools could better serve youth. At this meeting, the Progressive Education Association initiated a commission on the relation of school and colleges to explore possibilities of better coordination of school and college work and to seek an agreement that would provide freedom for secondary schools to attempt fundamental reconstruction. The commission's study was highly critical of the secondary schools of the day, but our concern is with its findings concerning the relations between schools and colleges. Aiken (1952) reports that this relation was viewed as unsatisfactory, noting that:

> In spite of the fact that formal education for five out of six of our youth ends at or before graduation from high school, secondary schools were still dominated by the idea of preparation for college. The curriculum was still chiefly "college preparatory." What the college prescribed for admission determined, to a large extent, what the boys and girls of the United States could study in school. (pp. 10-11)

This commission's work led directly to the Eight-Year Study which was designed to allow high schools to be freed from some of higher education's

restrictions. While it quickly became evident that the schools were not quite sure what to do with their newly found independence, Aiken (1952) suggests that "everyone involved in the study was convinced that some means should be found by which teachers in the schools and professors in the colleges should work together in mutual respect, confidence and understanding" (p. 16.).

The study, under Ralph Tyler's leadership, demonstrated that schools could make significant gains in educating students if freed from college restrictions. It also demonstrated that traditional course titles provided colleges with little information about what students had learned. The study provided other information that might have led to better communications between schools and colleges if the onset of WW II had not distracted the nation from concern about its schools.

While these examples of school/college interaction focus primarily on the articulation of the programs, the nation's schools were also greatly influenced during the first half of the 20th century by a number of networks--many of which included representatives from schools and universities. Tyack and Hansot in Managers of Virtue (1982) discuss these networks in some detail. They also observed that terminology was difficult, as they note:

> Networks resist definition. The word itself is a metaphor for a connecting web with much open space. As we use the term here, we mean an informal association of individuals who occupied influential positions (usually in university education departments or schools, as policy analysts or researchers in foundations, and as key superintendents), who shared common purposes . . . who had common interests in furthering their own careers, and who had come to know one another mostly through face-to-face interactions and through their similar writing and research. (p. 130)

Many of these networks consisted of individuals who attended the same schools and worked under a particular professor who served as their sponsor. To get an idea of how pervasive these networks became, consider the fact that at one time "sixteen of the eighteen superintendents in the largest American cities were former students of Strayer" (Tyack and Hansot 1982, 135). George Strayer of Teachers College--and, later, Paul Mort of the same school, Ellwood Cubberley of Stanford, and Charles Judd of the University of Chicago were among those whose early influence was spread through these managerial networks.

One of the activities promoted by these networks was the conducting of surveys that provided consulting fees for the professors, and training and connections for graduate students, which resulted in making school districts look alike in the way in which staff were allocated and student programs were described. Considering the supposed extent of local control, there is no question but that these networks contributed much to developing a national school system.

Our search is for relationships that can be described as being symbiotic. In that regard, Tyack and Hansot (1982) speak to the relation between university professors and their students:

> In return for assistance in moving ahead on the chessboard of superintendencies, the alumnus helped the professor recruit students, invited the sponsor to consult for or survey his district, notified him of vacancies, helped place graduates, and kept him in touch with the field. . . . His advancement often depended on pleasing his sponsor as well as the local school board. . . .
>
> The system employed by professors at Teachers College illustrated this symbiosis in its fullest development under George Strayer, Paul Mort and Nicolaus Englehardt. (p. 142)

Goodlad has advocated a symbiotic relationship between schools and universities. He has also stressed that this relationship must be selfless and concerned with mutual self-interests. While these sponsorship relationships were (and are) concerned with mutual self interests, they would appear to fail the test of being selfless. They also serve to remind us that any kind of relationship can be used for a variety of purposes.

While this is clearly not the use for a symbiotic relationship that Goodlad has in mind in advocating the creation of school/university partnerships, it does help clarify what is meant by such a relationship and it does describe collaborative effort that has (because it continues today) profound impact on our nation's schools. As Tyack and Hansot (1982) note:

> The sponsorship system placed a premium on similarity of opinions and background characteristics and probably did much unconsciously to insure that the top positions in public education rarely went to women, to minorities, or to others deviating from the male, white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant norm. (p. 143)

In short, they made the schools alike, because they saw to it that the leaders were alike.

In this regard, it is interesting to note that women made early use of networking to establish their position in education and to help establish the public school system we know today. Tyack and Hansot discuss female networks and educational reform during the later part of the 19th century and the early 20th century (pp. 63 ff).

During the past two decades, women have renewed this use with the

significant difference that, instead of using networks to enlarge women's influence in a male-dominated society, they have utilized networks to promote their own power in society. For a recent discussion of the formal, conscious way that women are now using networking, see Schmuck (1986).

Early networks were not limited to professor-student sponsorships. The Cleveland Conference, initiated in 1915, is cited as an example of a powerful private network of superintendents, university professors, and others in education who have had a powerful influence on the shaping of education in this country. As Tyack and Hansot (1982) point out, this was "indeed an old-boy network," (p. 133), with Blacks first admitted in 1946 and women first becoming active in the 1960s. The group was in a position to influence who received key appointments, to influence the distribution of foundation grants and, through its deliberations on the need for a more progressive educational system, to contribute significantly to the shape of the educational program itself.

Members of a network such as the Cleveland Conference might also be a part of sponsor networks, of networks within professional organizations such as the NEA, and of political networks. Thus, the strength of individuals in one set of relationships could be extended beyond the immediate boundaries of that network.

Thus we see that school/university collaboration between the late 19th century and the outbreak of WW II can generally be characterized as follows:

1. College efforts to provide for articulation with the lower schools by prescribing entrance requirements, specifying courses, and establishing entrance examinations. School officials' involvement was largely in the role of determining how they could satisfy the colleges, with several noteworthy exceptions such as the eight-year study.

2. Informal networks of university and school leaders that served to produce similarity among schools, to promote the personal power of individuals in the networks, and to establish conceptual, "scientific" approaches to school management. Often these relationships were symbiotic for the individuals involved--demonstrating that symbiotic relationships can be used for the benefit of the institutions involved or the enhancement of the individual's personal prestige.

Recent Collaborative Efforts

Following WW II, school/university collaboration was fueled by several forces. The end of the war produced a large group of GI-bill-supported graduate students who were utilized by the colleges to complete even more surveys and field studies than had been possible during the preceding decades. At the same time, the "baby boom" produced a rapid expansion of the public schools, which increased the need for the kinds of services the university survey teams could provide.

The boom also expanded the need for cooperation in the preparation of teachers as, by this time, most states had adopted a four-year degree as a

minimum requirement for teachers, and colleges throughout the country were scrambling to produce enough credentialed graduates. Previous efforts to train teachers in campus laboratory schools were criticized as being unrealistic and, anyway, they could not support the number of students that the colleges needed to produce. Therefore, the colleges turned to public school settings for locations for cadet or student teachers. Curtis and Andrews (1954) cite Association for Student Teaching yearbooks written in the late forties and early fifties to support their contention that "more students are being placed in cooperating public schools for their student teaching experiences [and] student teaching is rapidly becoming a cooperative enterprise between public schools and colleges" (p. 2).

Maeroff (1983), reviewing the history of school/university collaboration, noted that:

> After Sputnik togetherness flourished . . . new curricula in biology, physics, English, and mathematics were prepared. Schools and colleges, together, pushed for excellence in education.
>
> The relationship was at times unhealthy. Colleges would often take the schools for granted. In paternalistic fashion, curricula would be packaged and teacher training programs planned with little or no consultation with the schools. (p. 2)

Maeroff observes that collaboration "came to a screeching halt" during the 1960s. The many cooperative efforts reported in the literature for the 1960s contradict him.

In 1966, the Association for Student Teaching and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education sponsored a workshop, which

titled its report: Partnership in Teacher Education. In that extensive report, the participants explored issues associated with partnerships, such as the politics of school-college collaboration and new approaches to preparing teachers. They also included reports of several innovative, cooperative efforts, including the League of Cooperating Schools initiated by John Goodlad between the Graduate School of Education at UCLA and a number of Southern California schools. As described in Smith and Goodlad (1966), this league was intended to develop intermediaries--persons who could facilitate interaction between the knowledge-producing function of the university and the service performed by the schools. It would also provide, through collaboration, an improved setting for clinical experiences in teacher education. Speaking specifically to the intention of creating intermediaries, Goodlad noted that:

> We have very few "intermediate engineers" who can move back and forth in such a way that they truly serve to bridge the gap between theoretical conceptualization and practice. Worse, we have very few creative individuals who are committed to action and who have access to laboratories where they can effect their plans. (Smith and Goodlad 1966, 17)

Goodlad discusses this league extensively in The Dynamics of Educational Change (1975) and elsewhere. It serves as the forerunner for The Partnership involving Southern California school districts and UCLA, which was referred to at the beginning of this monograph. This group is now known as The Southern California Council for Education Renewal and is a member of the National Network for Educational Renewal. While the league was able to accomplish some of its expectations, Goodlad and those working

with him concluded that the partnership needed to draw in central office support if school reform was going to be achieved. Consequently, today's council includes districts with the university, not just schools.

For years, beginning in the first half of the century, the laboratory school on the university campus served as a principal link between schools and universities. Maeroff (1983) notes that relationships between these two levels of education suffered when these laboratory schools gave way to lack of funds and support during the 1970s, noting that their number declined to around 95 during that time. Others have noted that the social concerns of the late 1960s and early 1970s and the enrollment decline in schools of education during the 1970s contributed to the demise of these schools in many areas. In any event, their disappearance compounded the need for individuals who could bridge the school and college cultures.

Perhaps one of the reasons that so few individuals exist who can function as the kind of intermediary that Goodlad described as necessary to obtain effective collaboration is that neither schools nor universities as institutions place high value on collaboration with the other. One of the most common themes in discussion of the history of collaborative efforts is the difficulty in achieving effective relations because the university community places little value on these activities in comparison to work viewed as true scholarship or other duties of the professors. Ladd (1966) discusses the tensions in school-university collaboration, a theme expounded on with great vigor by Haberman in 1971. Haberman argued that there are 23 reasons why universities cannot educate teachers, beginning

with the suggestion that they are different cultures whose inhabitants cannot be expected to work cooperatively. This theme will be discussed further later. The point to be made here is that these tensions exist. They may have become particularly evident as the graduate students of post-WW II days attempted to build for themselves a reputation as legitimate members of the university community of scholars. During the Sputnik era, attacks on educationists probably gave impetus to the drive of college of education professors to distance themselves from their public school colleagues and prove themselves in the arena of pure research and publication which would bring them faculty recognition and promotion. Another factor may have been that the new breed of professor in the colleges of education tended to consist of individuals without prolonged public school experience, in contrast to the early professors of colleges of education who came into their positions with a record of successful field service as a starting point.

While the baby boom promoted the need for collaboration between universities and schools in order to find sufficient settings for training student teachers, the decline in school enrollment of the 1970s also promoted cooperation. As Davies and Aquino noted, major emphases during this time shifted to inservice education and continuing professional development. They summarized major projects of such agencies as the Chief State School Officers, AACTE, and the federal government, all of which were engaged in supporting collaborative efforts for such training. Among the most rapidly growing of the approaches to collaboration were teacher

centers of which there were estimated to be 4500 in number by the fall of 1975, and more were on the way. While many of these centers did not include universities, most involved collaboration of several agencies and professional organizations. To some, they were seen as a threat to established school district and college roles in developing professional personnel. Among those with such a view were many of the leaders of the centers (Devaney 1982).

In 1985, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities reported results of an extensive survey of members' involvement in school/university collaboration (Roberts 1985). Nearly one-third of the institutions said that the president or the chancellor was in regular contact with the schools, and that "virtually all education departments have regular contact with the schools." Seventy-three percent of the institutions responding reported they were involved "in a formal consortium or council which meets regularly with school officials to discuss school concerns" (Roberts, p. 2). Teacher training and in-service education of teachers and administrators were the most frequent types of involvement among the 228 institutions responding to the survey. Seventy-two of these colleges mentioned that they were involved in specific programs targeted at local needs that were developed through cooperative effort with the schools (Roberts, p. 2). Only 37 of these institutions were the sole providers of in-service training in their particular "market." In other words, 84 percent of these colleges had competition for their services to the schools. In most cases there were at least three institutions competing

(Roberts, pp. 2 & 16). With the hustling for students to maintain faculty teaching loads, the competitive market became a new stimulator of growth for the idea of school/university collaboration. In short, if the college could get schools to join in a partnership it could protect a market for its services. While this may be one way in which self-interests are served, it probably does not lead to the kind of symbiotic, more selfless relationship we are seeking.

One gets an idea of the scope of these cooperative efforts from the listing of program needs identified from the survey:

Making elementary and secondary students and their parents more aware of postsecondary educational opportunities including financial aid.

Maintaining enrollments and expanding the pool of qualified applicants.

Matching high school graduation requirements and college entrance requirements.

Better preparing high school students to enter the college program.

Enrolling high school students concurrently in college courses.

Recruiting minority students.

Retraining or in-service education of school teachers in specific subject areas of critical need.

Meeting teacher shortages in the public schools.

Improving communication or cooperation between school and college faculty.

Recruitment of teacher education candidates.

Educational leadership.

Training of lay boards.

Student motivation.

Evaluation.

Various curriculum concerns. (Roberts 1985, 17)

Further evidence of the scope of these collaborative efforts may be deduced from the fact that colleges spent an average of $85,000 per institution for these efforts (Roberts 1985, 17). While this indicates a substantial commitment (not quite as substantial when it is recognized that most of the funds came from outside the regular budget of the college), it is hardly enough to make major changes in the nature of education in either the schools or the colleges.

In spite of all of these reports of collaboration, Maeroff reported in 1983 that "Historically, the preparation of teachers has been dominated by higher education. The schools have had little to say about it and are rarely consulted" (p. 27).

This lengthy discussion of the history of school/university collaboration has been provided partially to help the reader understand the nature of current relationships, but particularly because many contemporary accounts of these collaborations lead the reader to believe that collaboration is some bright new invention that can cure all manner of ills. For example, Danzberger and Usdan (1984), discussing Atlanta's experience, begin by stating that they "studied the ways in which partnerships have been built over the years in that city." They then note that the "beginning of the partnership between the school system and the Atlanta

community dates back to the economic crisis that confronted the city in the mid-Seventies" (p. 394). Ignoring the obvious fact that the Atlanta schools are of the community and therefore have been in a close relationship since their creation, it is more disturbing that they also ignored the existence of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service, described by Goodlad (1975) as "an almost unprecedented collaboration among six school districts and an equal number of institutions of higher learning" which he had been associated with for a nine-year period from the later forties through the mid-fifties. Perhaps both the authors describing the Atlanta experience and the individuals living it would have benefited from a historical review, because they concluded that the partnership would have been more successful if higher education had been brought into the picture earlier. Meanwhile it had moved its headquarters to Georgia State University to secure its independence from the school district and the major corporate sponsors of the partnership (Danzberger and Usdan, p. 396).

One of the problems associated with investigating the various collaborative efforts of schools and universities is that they tend to be reported only by participants in the relationship, and then usually by the university participant. There are several exceptions. Noteworthy as examples are the case studies completed under the sponsorship of the NIE by Havelock, Huberman, and their colleages (Havelock et al. 1982), which were published beginning in 1981. As we turn to an examination of current models of school/university collaboration, it is worth noting that the starting place in the general model used for these studies of interorgani-

zational agreements was what this group of scholars termed "antecedent coupling." Incorporated within this notion is the history of collaboration between the entities engaged in the partnership, the number of formal and informal links, the degree of coupling, the university service centrality, and the goal congruence of the institutions involved (Havelock et al. 1982, 212). For them, it was necessary to understand what had gone before in order to properly describe the present.

Based on this general review of the long history of school/university collaboration, those who would seek to form such arrangements, or to study those already formed, or to derive the most benefits possible from those which exist, would also be wise to seek to understand the origins of the partnership in question. Those who believe they have discovered some bright new idea are doomed to spend considerable energy relearning the experiences of the past--and are quite likely to be dismayed by some of the obstacles they face that have been both generated and encountered over the years of interaction between these institutions.

IV. EXAMINATION OF CONTEMPORARY EXAMPLES OF SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY COLLABORATION

Let us turn our attention to an examination of several specific examples of school/university collaboration as one way to gain a better understanding of the nature of such arrangements.

The Metropolitan School Study Council: Forty-five Years of Relationships

This discussion is based primarily on Havelock's 1981 case study, supplemented by information in an article by Ann Lieberman (1986) and by a brief personal conversation with Lieberman in the spring of 1986. Other information comes from personal experiences with the efforts of the council during the past twenty-five years.

The Metropolitan School Study Council is a collaboration based at Teachers College, Columbia University. It owes its claim of a forty-five-year history to its founding by Paul Mort in 1941, following a conference with a group of superintendents concerned--as he was--with measuring those characteristics that identify "lighthouse" school districts. Its roots were clearly in the earlier old-boy networks that involved George Strayer, Paul Mort, and others in substantial relationships with superintendents and school districts throughout the country.

Havelock (1981) notes that:

> In the late 1940s and early 1950s it evolved into a rather powerful mechanism for the development and diffusion of innovations and systematic improvement across the full gamut of school district concerns; indeed the model itself became a popular innovation which spread as a "movement" across the country and became a dominant mode of university-school interaction through the 1950s and into the 1960s. (p. 28)

The council was originally formed for the specific purpose of collecting and feeding back information on innovative practices in school districts. At its peak it included as many as seventy school districts and helped to spawn not only similar collaborations at other universities, but also a national network of its own. When Havelock reported his case study, the council had 29 districts in its membership. As of 1986, there were forty six. Two part-time professors, a part-time coordinator, and several graduate students served as its 1985-86 staff (Lieberman 1986a). The council has an advisory board of administrators from the participating districts but, according to Havelock, its operational decisions "tend to be made by the secretariat and are routinely approved by the board" (p.13). The school districts tend to be predominately in the affluent suburban counties outside of New York. In the early days of the council they were all wealthy districts.

Paul Mort's focus was on surveys and measurement of school district adaptability and quality. By 1944 he and the council had initiated an innovative device known as the "Growing Edge," which served not only to help superintendents to explain to their boards and community how well they were doing, but also provided a framework for many Mort-directed doctoral studies. This effort led to several spinoff networks which provided

similar measurement information throughout the country and significant income for Mort and his research efforts (Havelock 1981, 18).

For the ten years that followed Mort's retirement, Paul Vincent led the council and focused on a similar survey tool called "Indicators of Quality." With his retirement the key individual leadership and sharp focus of purpose also left the council and a decline set in that led to a recommendation from a "rump board of directors" in 1976 to terminate the council.

Instead of eliminating the council, the university changed its place in the organizational structure and appointed a new leader who "breathed life" into it (Havelock 1981, 13). With several timeouts to recharge and pursue other interests, Ann Lieberman served as director from 1976 to 1986. While the original council had interacted primarily with the superintendents, Lieberman focused on supporting practice and teacher improvements at the school level. She increased membership by initiating a series of workshops and conferences that brought administrators and teachers together on critical issues. She developed a strong cadre of graduate assistants who were dedicated to helping teachers change rather than developing surveys. Several sub-networks have developed within the council, one of the most successful focusing on the improvement of writing in the schools.

In describing outcomes of the council, Havelock (1981) noted:

> While the old IOA [council] had long been known as a kind of "old boys' network for superintendents," the revived network deliberately sought and succeeded in establishing linkages at the teacher and principal levels as well as among district staff in various roles. (p. 15)

School districts that are involved have clearly benefitted from the high quality seminars and workshops as well as from some of the specific developmental activities such as the writing across the curriculum project. The fellows (graduate students) have been helped, as were their predecessors under Strayer, Mort, and Vincent. However, the impact on the school districts and on the university as institutions appears to be minor. Havelock concluded that:

> In spite of the outpouring of activity generated in the revival, the impact on member districts was not great relative to other forces in the environment. Most of the resources it provided were also available from other network-like arrangements and service agencies which abounded in the region. Thus it was generally regarded by superintendents as worthwhile and providing intellectual inputs of the highest quality but rather inconsequential among the rich and varied assortment of in-service and linking opportunities available to them. There was no district for which it could be said to have provided a service which was either essential or one which was not offered by another source.
>
> Likewise, few university informants other than the IOA [Council] staff itself were likely to rate the IOA in its present configuration as an essential aspect of the university, certainly not in a survival sense. No department relied to a large degree on IOA member districts for recruitment, pre-service training sites, research sites, or graduate placement sites. . . . (pp. 15-16)

As one examines this long-standing collaborative effort, several conclusions are quickly apparent. The need for a key leader is forcefully demonstrated. Not only did the council flounder when left without its two early leaders, it quickly ran into problems when, from time to time, it temporarily lost the inspirational leadership of Ann Lieberman.

The collaboration is not a symbiotic one. It fails to meet the partnership tests identified by Goodlad. In spite of its illustrious history,

it probably is more a network than a partnership. In fact, Havelock in his study and Lieberman in her conversations about the council refer to it as a network.

Because it was so successful during the forties and fifties and led to the creation of so many similar models, it serves as one of the reasons why, although there are many collaborations, it is difficult to find partnerships of the kind sought by Goodlad for his renewal effort.

The Partnership: A School-University Collaboration
(Now named The Southern California Council for Education Renewal)

This summary is developed from an unpublished description of The Partnership prepared by Kenneth Sirotnik in the summer of 1985; on an LSCE occasional paper, "Linking Educational Theory and School Practice: The Laboratory in School and Community Education" (1985); on conversations with Gene Tucker and Pat Clark White, who are current school district leaders in The Partnership; and on several discussions with John Goodlad, Paul Hechman, and Kenneth Sirotnik, who were actively involved with the creation and initial development of The Partnership while they were working at UCLA. Also used was information obtained in May 1986 during a meeting of The Partnership, at which a new name was authorized. Information concerning antecedent activities is also drawn from The Dynamics of Educational Change (Goodlad 1975).

In an earlier section, reference was made to the League of Cooperating Schools developed by John Goodlad as a collaboration between 18 schools and the laboratory school at UCLA under the auspices of I/D/E/A. The league operated from 1966 through 1972 as a part of the Study of Educational Change and School Improvement. This project:

> pioneered some areas which now constitute the conventional wisdom of educational improvement: the importance of the single school as a focus for curricular and instructional improvement; the critical role of the principal; the need for teachers to develop decision-making competence; the importance of conceiving and acting upon the vision of schools as renewing organizations; the importance of school/community bridges; and the importance of some outside agency for stimulation and encouragement (the role of the "alternative drummer"). (LSCE Staff 1985, 4)

This league grew out of an hypothesis developed by Goodlad in 1955 that "the single school with its principal, teachers, pupils, parents, and community links is the key unit for educational change" (Goodlad 1975, 81). His strong call in A Place Called School (1984) for reconstructing the American Public School system one school at a time demonstrates that he has not given up on this hypothesis. Why then, a shift from a league of individual schools to the collaboration of school districts characterizing The Partnership? A partial answer can be uncovered in some of the conclusions reached about the effectiveness of the league.

As work proceeded with the league, Goodlad and his colleagues remained convinced that the school is the optimal unit for change. However, they came to recognize that "more attention must be given to total school districts and their administrators [and] to teacher education institutions. . . ." (Goodlad 1975, 184). He noted that:

> It is clear, also, that we should have done even more to bring the superintendents into our thinking and planning. We provided them with a great deal of information, but they are busy people who tend to gain the data they need from people rather than documents . . . we should have conducted occasional seminars for superintendents designed to stimulate their thinking about problems of effecting change in schools and school systems. (Goodlad 1975, 182)

He reached this conclusion in part because he observed that:

> League principals, in particular, underestimated and often made erroneous predictions regarding the interest of the central office. Almost uniformly, they expected that office to support, and indeed, praise them for deviant activity. Some of them found out differently.

While there was a number of conclusions reached about changing education as a consequence of league activities, the one that is immediately germane is the recognition of the need for appropriate involvement of the bureaucracy as well as the individual schools. Late in 1979, educators at UCLA developed the Laboratory in School and Community Education and, as part of that lab, worked to create The Partnership. Originally formed as the "Consortium" and later titled The Partnership [the struggle for terminology that is useful persists, as it has now become a "council"], the rationale for the new unit stated that:

> the conditions facing the schools, educators, students and communities could be met most successfully only by the collective power of all those segments of the educational enterprise which are responsible for some part of the whole. (LSCE Staff 1985, 17-18)

As of 1984-85, The Partnership was a consortium that included UCLA, twelve school districts, two community colleges, and five county school

offices. Its purposes included obtaining "improved schools; developed educative communities; and an elevated level of discussion about the issues in American education" (LSCE Staff 1985, 19).

The governing body of The Partnership in 1984-85 was a council composed of the chief executive officers of the institutions that are members of the group. Activities of The Partnership have included (1) sponsoring public forums with educational and political leaders, (2) conducting workshops, (3) developing principals' leadership skills, (4) developing curriculum and processes for curriculum improvement, (5) providing a supportive network for those experimenting with cooperative learning, (6) inquiring into the problems and possibilities of computer usage in the classroom, and (7) providing responses to specific requests for assistance from member institutions such as work on heterogeneous grouping of students and dealing with problems of substance abuse.

The importance to the organization of a key individual is evident as one examines its original growth and its uncertain status today. With the departure from UCLA of Goodlad and other staff members who were involved, the group of school leaders at times during 1985 referred to itself as a partnership looking for a partner. During the spring of 1986, UCLA's dean of Education reassigned responsibility for the university's role in The Partnership to the Office of Academic Interinstitutional Programs and Assistant Dean Juan Lara. School district and university officials spoke optimistically of renewed opportunities.

As the 1986-87 school year began, the members of the partnership sought to work out details concerning leadership, budget, and program priorities. In October, as this monograph was being completed, the seven school districts that remained in the partnership parted ways with UCLA. They decided to seek a relationship with one or more of the other outstanding universities in the Los Angeles area. School officials indicated they were looking for university faculty members who were sincerely interested in using collaboration as a way of improving schools and universities. Whether the members of this partnership will be able to get it back on its original path toward a symbiotic relationship remains to be seen.

The Puget Sound Educational Consortium: A Newcomer on the Block

The information contained in this discussion is based on personal conversations with former Bureau of School Service and Research Director, Robert Anderson, and on the author's numerous personal involvements with the University of Washington over a 33-year period, as well as on the author's direct involvement in the creation of the PSEC.

While it is the newest of the collaborations discussed so far, the PSEC has its roots in earlier collaborative efforts involving the University of Washington and schools in the state. In the 1950s a fund was established

in the College of Education to provide for costs of mileage and other support to professors working with schools. This fund, administered by John Corbally, became the basis for the Bureau of School Service and Research, which was expanded by Gordon Lee when he came to the university as dean. Aware of the gains obtained at Teacher's College, Lee employed retiring Seattle Superintendent Earnest Campbell to establish the bureau in 1965. Campbell created an advisory board of local area superintendents and hired Joe Chandler, outgoing Washington Education Association Executive Secretary and well known lobbyist. The bureau completed an extensive study of the experiences of first-year teachers and reported it to the faculty, but had little lasting impact on either the college or the local schools during those times.

After several directors followed Campbell, Robert Anderson was appointed in the late 1960s. Initially there was university funding for Anderson and an assistant director, three graduate assistants, and secretarial help. While Anderson and his assistant both carried teaching assignments, the university commitment was substantial. The BSSR attempted to respond quickly to service needs of local schools districts. Between 1969 and the early 1980s it helped local school districts consolidate, participated in surveys of district needs for capital construction and program development, completed major federally funded studies of voucher systems, studied problems such as school closure for local districts, and acted as a linking agent for districts looking for specific help from faculty members.

The BSSR did not initiate studies and was not seen by professors as a likely conduit through which they could initiate their own projects. Neither did the BSSR restrict in any way the private consulting efforts of various faculty members. Some faculty members continued to work extensively with local schools in arenas such as teacher evaluation, curriculum development, and special education, with little contact with the BSSR.

Throughout this period, several advisory groups were established for specific programs at the university, for the BSSR, for departments within the College of Education, and for other programs where the university and the schools interacted. Also, as the 1970s progressed, the university faced severe funding problems which, by the early 1980s, threatened the existence of the College of Education. On the one hand, the advisory groups were telling the college that it needed to be more attuned to the field, while the university was telling the college it needed to justify its existence as part of a major research institution. The college drastically reduced its teacher preparation program, going for "quality rather than quantity." It scaled back, then eliminated its support for the BSSR. This forced the BSSR to survive from fees charged for its services, but without the underwritten positions, it did not have the sales forces (or the product) needed to generate substantial fees. Generally the college seemed to be withdrawing from interaction with the world around it. However, some of its faculty members were not willing to be isolationists--in fact, they doubted that survival was possible if withdrawal continued.

Andrews and Soder (1985-86) described the next events relevant to the development of this collaboration. They noted:

> As in other parts of the country over the years, many public school professionals have felt that university faculty efforts are irrelevant to the real life difficulties of day-to-day public school teaching and administration. Many university faculty members have perceived public school professionals as overly pragmatic and seemingly uninterested in questions of conceptualization, theory building and research. (p. 39)

The university decided to reach out and enter a collaborative arrangement with the Seattle School District. Both the College of Education and the Seattle schools were facing major crises--insufficient funds, dilemmas over program, and lack of public confidence. As Andrews and Soder noted:

> Both the district and the university have to protect their respective technical cores. Each had two basic policy alternatives: buffer the core from the environment or adopt bridging strategies. Both organizations took the later approach. . . . (p. 43)

The collaboration of these two institutions provided strength for both. Meanwhile, other districts in the metropolitan area were concerned about the need to develop effective responses to the call for school reform which burst on the scene in the early 1980s. Working with Richard Andrews and John Goodlad--who had relocated from UCLA, nine of these districts initiated a series of summer leadership seminars which brought to the university leading scholars concerned with school change and renewal in a setting where there could be in-depth consideration of the issues of the day.

These summer seminars led to the creation of institutes for local high school principals that were developed by them and university faculty members. Other cooperative ventures began to emerge and, in the summer of

1985, the districts and the university formalized the PSEC with a five-year commitment.

The PSEC now has twelve districts, and other districts are seeking to join, although its current bylaws limit membership to twelve. It is funded by each district paying a base fee and a per-student fee, and the provision by the university of partial time of three staff members and office and secretarial support. The consortium is governed by a coordinating council consisting of the superintendents of each of the districts and the dean of the College of Education. Professor Andrews served during the first year as a non-voting chair of the council.

Following an extensive national search, the PSEC hired Ann Lieberman from Teacher's College and the Metropolitan School Study Council as its executive director.

The PSEC has identified six major functions:

1. interactive research on topics of common interest,
2. improvement of basic and clinical professional programs,
3. improvement of continuing education programs,
4. inter-organizational exchanges of personnel,
5. computerized linkages for exchange of information,
6. advocacy of educational reform.

Task forces worked throughout 1985-86 to define specific projects that could accomplishing the overall purposes of the consortium. With the

arrival in the summer of 1986 of the executive director, The Partnership looked forward to a promising future.

What can be learned from an effort that is so new? After all, at the time of this writing the PSEC is not quite a year old as a formal partnership. There seem to be several preliminary conclusions that are in order, even in the face of the short tenure of the PSEC. First, there are the possibilities of a symbiotic relationship. Looking back at the previous efforts of the university to provide service to the schools, caution is raised because this history may influence both the university and the school personnel in the PSEC toward a model that is not intended. However, the Seattle/university collaboration grew out of mutual needs and took a direction different from previous service efforts--many of the participants in that effort (which continues alongside the PSEC) are players in the new consortium. Furthermore, the pressures that developed the mutual need are still at work.

The leadership elements in the personages of John Goodlad, Richard Andrews, James Doi (Dean of the College of Education) and others at the university are joined by the new executive director and by a cadre of superintendents who have committed time and money to the development of the program. This cadre is beginning to expand--as it must if success is to be achieved--to principals, teachers, and other university faculty members. These leaders are committed to central ideas, not just to the notion of having an organization. Later we will speak to the Mrs. Dewar principle as expounded by Sarason (1977). It is at work here as it appears to have been

at work in the initial development of the Metropolitan School Study Council and The Partnership at UCLA.

While the future is promising and the possibility exists that this consortium will satisfy the criteria established for a true partnership, there is a long road to travel before this is achieved. There are dangers that the substantial early funding commitments will create pressures for quick results that would be counter to the model of change envisioned. Although the PSEC group has been working together for three years, there is still relatively little involvement of school people--threatening to make the group a new version of the old-boy's club. (Since many of the participants are women, it would be new only in that it would be a mixed group.) Although the PSEC has received strong support from the university's president and academic officers, faculty in the College of Education and elsewhere in the university continue to express doubts as to whether they will really receive appropriate recognition for contributions to the PSEC. This may be because some continue to look at it as a service relationship in which they, as college faculty members, are expected to give something to the schools, rather than as a relationship that can truly be mutually beneficial.

* * * *

So far, consideration has been given to three contemporary collaborations with considerable attention to the antecedent activities, as well as some effort to determine what can be learned from them concerning such

collaborative efforts. Before turning attention to generalizations concerning collaborations, we will look briefly at several other cases reported in the literature. In these cases we will focus on current collaborations without dwelling on the way they developed.

While the first three reviews relied on multiple sources and some personal contacts, the discussion of the remaining cases is based on a limited number of sources--often only one--for each case.

Southwest Texas Program for Improving Basic Skills Instruction in the Secondary Schools (Parkay, 1986)

Created to promote "a thoughtful, inquiry-oriented dialogue between the university and the participating schools on how to teach the basic skills most effectively" (Parkay 1986, 386), this partnership involved six secondary schools and the Center for the Study of Basic Skills at Southwest Texas State University. Participating schools included four public schools, a boarding school, and a Job Corps program. An advisory committee consisting of the principal, a student, a community leader, and a teacher not involved in the project was created for each site. Project teachers attended monthly one-day workshops on campus and participated in two-week summer workshops for which they were compensated by stipends and academic credit. They were then expected to use their new skills and share them with fellow teachers.

The program was based on an inquiry oriented change model that includes five components (cf. Robert Schaefer 1967):

1) thorough diagnosis of existing instructional problems;

2) careful selection of research-proven strategies;

3) extensive teacher involvement, from the planning and diagnostic stages through implementation;

4) direct channels for two-way, face-to-face communication;

5) a flexible schedule for implementation. (Parkay 1986, 388)

This case provides no direct contributions to development of a theoretical base for understanding school/university collaboration. However, the teachers who participated identified seven things about the experience that they felt enhanced their sense of professionalism:

* sharing materials and techniques across school boundaries;

* developing long-term, collegial, problem-solving groups at their own schools;

* being treated--often for the first time--as professionals;

* acquiring new, research-based materials and strategies;

* extending their understanding of how and why students learn or fail to learn;

* clarifying instructional goals and objectives; and

* receiving encouragement and support for trying new approaches and growing professionally. (Parkay 1986, 389)

Project reporter Parkay asserts that this partnership demonstrates that if the school/university collaboration concentrates on the process of change rather than on any specific set of changes, it can be successful.

To support his contention, he points to a 17.75 percent increase in basic skills scores for students, teacher reports of renewed zest for teaching, and signs of strong commitment to professional growth. Unlike some collaborative efforts, this partnership stressed a "full intellectual partnership" (p. 389), rather than one emphasizing equality of governance.

University of Utah Professional Development Centers (Holt and Peterson 1981)

After negotiations with local school districts, the University of Utah collaborated with eight elementary schools to create professional development centers with three major purposes:

> 1) sites for clinical experiences including student teaching for teacher candidates,
>
> 2) centers within the state for inservice education,
>
> 3) to become involved in the study of education. (Holt and Peterson 1981, 66)

Professionals working in the public schools were appointed adjunct faculty members and a five- to eight-year commitment was established with each school. A university faculty member was appointed to work with each PDC. According to the project reporters, the "relationship is best described as collaborative, with policy determined by an executive committee made up of the principals of each PDC, administrative representatives from the school districts, and college faculty" (p. 66). However, it is revealing that these same reporters begin by indicating that "the

University of Utah has worked in eight elementary schools. . . . " They appear to retain the idea that they are providing service to the schools, rather than serving as partners with the schools.

This collaborative effort seeks to improve schools by improving the social climate in which teachers work. Toward this end, it feels that teachers were helped to work with each other because the presence of one to two student teachers per year for each public school teacher gave these teachers time to interact with one another. Teachers were also able to work with other adults instead of being isolated in the classroom as they worked with their student teachers. They sought, with limited success, to involve teachers as partners in research projects and hoped to provide an economic incentive that responded to the variation in talent and effort among the teachers--a hope that has not materialized because of a shortage of money.

Unlike most collaborative efforts reported in the literature, the Utah PDC effort reports results of several measures taken of participants. Unfortunately, they made no pre-PDC measurement, so the full significance of the data will have to await future measurements. Results reported to date reveal that principals, teachers, student teachers, and university faculty members have different views concerning what teacher role descriptors they value. The data also suggest that the PDCs have been more successful as student teacher centers than in providing inservice or in making other contributions to improvement of education. Finally, the data seem to indicate that teachers serving as adjunct professors behaved in a

very conservative manner; i.e., they did not reveal changed teacher behaviors from those typically found in classrooms in spite of the added time to work with each other or the other interventions that were part of the model. Holt and Peterson emphasize that their report is based on only the first two years of this collaborative effort; nevertheless, their findings seem to contradict some of the common claims by collaboration proponents. While the appointment of adjunct staff and the use of off-campus sites for pre-service training represent change in the college, true efforts at satisfying mutual needs are not fully demonstrated by the reporters.

The Queens College-Louis Armstrong Middle School Collaboration (Trubowitz et al. 1984, and Trubowitz 1986)

This collaboration was formed to enable members of a university school of education to assume responsibility for setting up and sustaining a new middle school. At first glance, this would seem to be a fairly limited-purpose example of a partnership. However, in reality it is one of the most complex and complete reported in the literature. It was originally formed out of conversations between Saul Cohen, newly appointed President of Queens College, and Frank Macchiarola, Chancellor of the New York City Public Schools. The middle school in question was a new facility that had been completed eight years earlier and left unoccupied as neighboring community districts, pressure groups concerned with desegregation, and the

courts debated over attendance boundaries and other issues. The collaboration evolved toward a true partnership between the central board of the New York Public Schools and the College of Education at Queens. In addition to the funds provided for staffing and materials from Queens and the normal support from the New York system, federal desegregation funds and several foundation grants helped in the earlier stages of the collaboration.

Governance was achieved through the appointment by the college of a director for the program and by the school system of a principal. Specific committees consisting of professional representatives from the public schools and the college, and of parents from the school were created for various purposes. For example, one such group developed the initial agreement and another was used to select the first principal. Those reporting on this venture indicate the difficulties of working with a large bureaucracy. The central board was not usually in the business of the direct operation of schools, since most are operated through community districts. The board frequently changed the person responsible for the program at the central level, and individuals working at the school found various divisions within the district giving what seemed to be contradictory direction. Central requirements for assigning and transferring personnel conflicted with programmatic needs of the school.

In spite of the many problems faced by the participants, the collaboration flourished. In his 1984 report, Seymour Sarason, who served as an external consultant to the project, said that individuals in the institutions:

> accomplished a great deal; the forging of a productive, personally rewarding collaboration that, to a gratifying extent, overcame obstacles inherent in the interaction of people from two different cultures. (In Trubowitz et al. 1984, 25)

More than most collaborations reported in the literature, this effort seems to have contributed to a renewal of a college of education as well as created a public school that, while falling short of the hopes of the collaborators, is still better matched to the age group that it serves than are other schools in the city, and has a large waiting list, low absenteeism, and high student test scores.

Trubowitz et al note that, when Cohen was appointed president of Queens College, the School of Education faculty had "been severely battered by mass firings during the 1976 New York City budget crunch and by the generally low status afforded it by the previous college administration" (p. 30). In fact, 45 percent of the education staff--67 faculty members--had been fired. With only senior, tenured faculty members averaging about 50 years old, "bitterness and disillusionment were wide spread" (p. 30).

The renewal of this school began as the president chose the education faculty as the first one with which he met--even before he assumed office--and in this initial meeting he began to move them toward action on the Louis Armstrong collaboration. Trubowitz et al. (1984) speak of the faculty's self-esteem growing as the president provided recognition, continuing psychological support, and a changed definition of a teaching load that allowed work at the public school to be a part of expected contact hours; and as he found other ways to modify the recognition system of the

college to credit faculty members for their achievements in the collaboration. Simultaneously with these accomplishments, the faculty is reported to have obtained recognition for its efforts from other departments within the college and from the community at large.

The participants in this endeavor concluded that the following factors were among those contributing to the successful development of a school/college collaboration:

* The support of the President of the college, which brought with it psychological encouragement and easier access to campus resources.

* The involvement of key personnel in the School of Education.

* The commitment of those involved in the project . . .

* The commitment of the college as represented by its contribution of materials and services . . . Associate Dean of Education . . . was assigned full time to the school.

* The attitude of the college staff, which avoided a "we the experts" approach to the school staff.

* The clear distinction of roles calling for the Principal to run the day-to-day affairs of the school.

* A recognition on the part of the college faculty that working in the school represents an opportunity to learn.

* Assigning only those college faculty to the school who express a desire to work in the field and who have the ability to work with teachers.

* The recognition that individual teacher change is rarely sufficient to bring about institutional change and the need to develop a broader orientation toward school renewal.

* The importance of ongoing discussion as a way of institutionalizing a process of self-examination.
(Trubowitz 1984, 60-62)

The collaboration, as others, was clearly dependent on contributions

from several key leaders--particularly the stimulus of the president who initiated the activity and the college director who nursed it through its developmental stages. By 1985, this collaboration had survived for seven years and was still going strong in spite of changes in the college presidency and the city schools' chancellorship. While it is difficult to assume that all collaborations will experience identical patterns of growth, Trubowitz offers a useful summary of the major life stages of this collaboration:

> Hostility and Skepticism
> Lack of Trust
> Period of Truce
> Mixed Approval
> Acceptance
> Regression
> Renewal
> Continuing Progress. (Trubowitz 1986, 19-21)

One of the most important observations in the 1986 review of the collaboration is that "with the passage of time it becomes clear that the development of a school-college partnership is a fluid process with no absolute endpoint" (1986, 20). The continuing change in personnel within the collaboration and in positions outside that influence the partnership, and the change in societal demands are among the factors that create this fluidity.

At this point, the Queen's College collaboration appears to have survived the crises created by changing leadership and to provide a model for others seeking to develop partnerships--even if it is limited in its size.

Brief Notes on Other Collaborations

The National Consortium for Educational Excellence (NCEE) is a federally funded group made up of 32 school-system superintendents and Peabody College at Vanderbilt University. Organized in 1983, it has three major goals:

* to analyze the applicability, feasibility, and desirability of "A Nation at Risk" and other national reports on education.
* assess the views of local school board members, educational practitioners, and others in regard to those recommendations.
* identify and describe exemplary programs and practices already in operation in the thirty-two participating school systems as current examples of excellence. (Bryan 1985, 14)

This effort may produce useful findings. It is not a symbiotic relationship; like most of the partnerships reported in recent years, it is an effort by the university to coordinate efforts to straighten out the schools. Bryan notes that the group has identified what needs to be done to improve schools. It is instructive to note that these improvements require changes in the schools, state, and federal government, but neglect the idea of changing the university. The NCEE follows the model of relationships perfected by Strayer, Cubberly et al.

Stanford University has a long history of collaboration with the schools. Cubberly's prowess as a sponsor was among the strongest of the early developers of managerial networks. During the 1950s and 1960s, the university was heavily involved in curriculum reform and in surveys related

to school construction and planning. Today Stanford claims substantial credit for pioneering school/university collaborative work, while acknowledging that "there are more than 200 groups across the United States trying some form of collaboration" (Walsh 1986, 8).

Nur (1983) reports on a research-oriented collaboration initiated by Stanford as part of the National Teacher Corps Program. This project focused on "research adaptation," which was defined as:

> A process in which teachers and researchers work with paritiy and assume equal responsibility to indentify, inquire into, and resolve problems of classroom teachers . . . using the knowledge base of previous research efforts. As a consequence, school practitioners and researchers participating in collaboration become agents of change. (p. 225)

The model in this collaboration used teams consisting of teachers, school administratos, faculty, and graduate students who met regularly to review school district needs in specific content areas and to design training activities. Specific areas of investigation were based on "mutually perceived" needs in reading, writing, mathematics, bilingual education, multicultural education, and administration. The mutuality built into the collaboration was an attempt to meet real needs of schools at the same time as satisfying the research interests of faculty. This project, as other teacher corps projects approached a symbiotic relationship but, perhaps because of their reliance on external funding, did not sustain themselves beyond the duration of the project.

Stanford's largest current undertaking has been a three-and-a-half year

project known as the Study of Stanford and the Schools (SSATS) which spent 1.4 million and involved some 40 Stanford faculty members collaborating with 13 Bay Area schools. Stanford also has a Round Table which provides for the gathering of local area superintendents and key university people. Descriptions of these efforts suggest many possible services from Stanford to surrounding schools but reveal little signs of the kind of partnership we are seeking. They appear to be following the historical tradition more than the collaborative relationship developed in the earlier Teacher Corps project.

The Willamette Valley (Oregon) Education Consortium has a longer history than many of the current collaborative efforts and has had more in the way of external evaluation than most. It was organized in 1974-75 and, as of 1984, included Western Oregon State College, eight school districts, and three education service districts (Hathaway 1985, 18). This consortium has focused on the basic skills of mathematics, reading, and writing. It seeks to develop outcome-based curricula in these subjects, using cross-district work groups composed of teachers, administrators, and consortium staff. Funding for the consortium comes from per student contributions from the districts, a contribution from the college, and the Oregon system of higher education, and much time from teachers and other participants. Again, this appears to be a hard-working, productive collaboration, but not one that is describable as a symbiotic relationship. Like most of the others, it appears to be a structure that is designed to allow the Oregon system of higher education to be of service to the schools. However, representatives of that system acknowledge that they receive benefits.

The Center for Educational Improvement at Loyola University (LCEI) is described as a "multidisciplinary unit within the university structure which coordinates Loyola's involvement with the New Orleans Public School System and the New Orleans Archdiocesan School System. Offered by its director, Glenn Hymel, as an example of collaboration, it is in reality an example of the old service model in which an office at the university facilitates the efforts to provide service to schools. As Hymel (1980) notes, the purpose of the LCEI is "impacting both the public and parochial school systems" (p. 5). Again, there is nothing wrong with universities providing service to schools, or even with their trying to reform chools--but such efforts do not represent the kind of partnership we are seeking.

Wilbur (1984) describes ten collaborative projects. Several of these seem to be achieving significant results. For example, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute reports that their effort has:

> significantly increased teacher preparation, raised their morale, heightened their expectations of students' ability to learn, and encouraged them to continue teaching in the community's public schools. (p. 40)

While it represents a cooperatively planned program with significant equality among the university and the school personnel, as it is described in this instance it appears to be intended to benefit one of the partners--the school.

On the other hand, Comer (1981 and 1985) has discussed this relationship at more length. He has described the way that efforts of Yale and New

Haven to work together have been enhanced by participation of the University of Connecticut and Bank Street College in related projects. He concludes from these interrelated projects that

> The research findings illustrate that an exchange of knowledge and skills does occur in collaborative efforts between universities and public schools. . . . In three separate projects [it has been observed that] the transfer of knowledge is a two way street. (Comer 1981, 68)

Comer's report on the various projects with New Haven demonstrate that collaboration does have mutual benefits. He also describes a successful interaction between several universities and public schools districts, whereas most partnerships involve only one institution of higher education. As Goodlad concluded after working with the League of Schools, Comer reports that the involvement of the central office of school districts was critical to the success of the New Haven partnerships. Because the three projects with New Haven were formed to improve the public schools, they do not provide direct evidence as to whether such relationships can simultaneously contribute to the improvement of schools and universities. Nevertheless, they do help us conclude that individuals in both kinds of institutions can benefit from such relationships.

On the other hand, the Pennsylvania State University/Keystone Central School District Teacher Corps Project was designed:

> to benefit both the school system and the university. The university would provide the school system with leadership training, resources for staff development, and technical expertise and training in evaluation. The school system, in turn, would provide the university with a research setting, contact with rural school realities, and potential graduate students. (Wilbur 1984, 41)

This collaborative effort, relying on a team consisting of teachers, administrative personnel, principals, and university staff members, was able to establish the mutual trust needed for effective functioning. With the ending of the Teacher Corps funds, the collaborative effort is said to have continued in the form of graduate courses being offered by Penn State. A project, which at first sounded like it might be a model of the kind being sought, appears to have turned into a rather typical relationship between a university and nearby schools.

Wilbur reports on a collaborative effort at Mississippi State University that has many of the elements of a true partnership. The Program of Research and Evaluation for Public Schools (PREPS) includes school districts in the vicinity of MSU, each of which pays membership dues ($4200 in 1984). The superintendents of member districts serve as the advisory council, determining what services are to be provided and advising the university on current issues in the public schools. In addition, each year the council chooses an overall research project that is intended to have collective impact on all of the participants. A priority for PREPS is "creating a self-renewing, self-improvement capacity within each of its member school districts" (Wilbur 1984, 43). Schools benefit by obtaining help in long-range planning and research and support for services they need. As Wilbur (1984) notes:

> MSU benefits, too. PREPS enhances public relations. It identifies new sources of funds that can be used to maintain quality staff at full-time level of employment. And, last but not least, it provides that fertile field for research. (p. 43)

Mutual self-interest is being served, and, at least as far as can be determined from the report, the relationships appear to be selfless. While

the aims of the consortium may not be quite as high as Goodlad's hoped-for simultaneous renewal of schools and universities, this consortium may be worth further study.

As noted previously, there are hundreds of collaborative efforts in the country today. The National Network for Educational Renewal for which this report is being prepared includes (as of August 1986) partnerships at the University of Southern Maine, University of Massachusetts, Michigan State University, Indiana University, University of Virginia, University of Arkansas and Central Arkansas, University of Colorado (Denver and Boulder) and Metropolitan State University, University of Wyoming, Brigham Young University, the University of Hawaii, and the University of Arizona, in addition to the Southern California Council on Education Renewal at UCLA and the PSEC at the University of Washington. As these partnerships continue to develop, it is anticipated that they will provide additional models of the true partnership being sought. One reason for optimism in this regard is that each has committed to the task of developing such a partnership.

Although this discussion has concentrated on examples of collaboration between schools and universities, a full review of the literature concerning relationships would have to examine the extensive material available concerning various kinds of networks. As mentioned previously, Parker (1977) reported on 29 networks in his paper, and others participating in that March 1977 conference sponsored by the NIE provided substantial information about a number of other networks. Conclusions from these

discussions regarding the nature of networks have already been reported. Inferences about how networks function will be presented later. Readers interested in examining specific cases will find Parker's analysis particularly helpful.

V. THE WHYS, WHEREFORES, AND WHATNOTS OF COLLABORATION

In this section we will examine the reasons individuals and organizations offer for seeking collaborative arrangements, and consider the benefits claimed for such efforts. Then we will turn to a review of the obstacles reported as creating difficulties for those who seek success through collaboration. Finally, we will discuss the suggestions that have been offered as to what conditions must be met for collaborations between schools and universities to be successful. To some extent we will incorporate previous comments about terminology and historical precedents for today's networks and partnerships, as well as reflect on case studies such as those reported in the preceding section and others available in the literature.

What Is to Be Gained From Collaboration?

In discussing definitions, we noted that schools and universities are reciprocally interdependent. Consistent with Thompson's (1967) explication of that concept, the outputs of each organization become the inputs of the other. This is a commonly cited reason for collaboration. For example, Hathaway (1985) notes that:

> The university and the school district are each other's own best resources. Between them, school districts and universities cover virtually the whole range of human learning. That we are interconnected is undeniable. The challenge before us is to realize and build upon the extent, the possibilities, and the necessity of our connection and dependence. (p. 4)

In several instances, the rationale for collaboration has been expressed simply as survival. Andrews and Soder (1985/86), Trubowitz et al. (1984), and Wu (1985) are among the authorities whose comments lend credence to the survival argument. Wu cites anthropologist S. T. Kimball to make his point that there are three needs for collaboration. He says organizations seek to cooperate when:

1. there is a threat from the outside
2. there is an identification of a common problem
3. there is a combination of the threat and the need to investigate the problem. (p. 7)

As Andrews and Trubowitz recite their respective case studies, one quickly reaches the conclusion that the survival of the higher education unit was closely tied to the creation of the collaboration, and there is no question but what the schools are faced with significant threats in both cases. De Bevoise (1986) quotes Goodlad as stating that "teacher education institutions are seriously threatened by the disaffection and sometimes outright hostility that educators in the nation's schools express toward them" (p. 9). She goes on to describe the conditions that Louisville University president, Donald Swain, and Jefferson County, Kentucky, school superintendent, Donald Ingwerson saw that caused them to initiate a collaboration:

> Both institutions needed to change. The problems of desegregation and reorganization in the school district, the need to build public respect and support for all levels of education, and scarce resources encouraged an openness to risk-taking and to experimentation in seeking improvement. (p. 10)

Since collaboration is one strategy by which organizations seek to continue their existence or to strengthen it, it is worth noting that, as Peterson (1977) points out, participation in networks is most important to those with less income, status, and power. While he is reflecting on individuals and various social and political groups, the same conclusion would seem reasonable in looking at school/university partnerships. However, in their case, both may be in a weak position relative to their environment and need each other in order to develop a stronger position. In that regard, Ambach (1982) warned that:

> Both secondary and postsecondary education . . . must address their connections with mutual support. Competition for government or private resources for the maintenance of education is so severe that it threatens to submerge the common interests and interdependence of the different levels of education beneath the drive for institutional survival. (p. 22)

Moving beyond the question of survival and responding to problems and threats, a number of authors have offered lists of benefits, Norris et al. (1984) provided one of the more comprehensive listings as noted in Table 1.

Table 1
Corresponding Benefits to Schools, Universities, and Individuals Participating in Collaborative Research

Benefits to Schools	Benefits to Universities	Benefits to Individuals
1. Institute new instructional programs or administrative procedures	Provide information for curriculum/requirement review	Facilitate new programs development based on research information
2. Develop student/parent services based on research results	Develop research centers to provide consultant services	Project plans as identified by needs assessment
3. Identify areas that need revison--policies, methods, objectives	Generate new hypotheses from findings	Analyze data to generate policy recommendations
4. Revise instructional programs	Improve teacher-training programs	Provide program direction through improved decision-making skills
5. Extrapolate practical applications of research data	Test solutions to problems in the field	Utilize problem-solving techniques
6. Acquire information for staff training and public information programs	Develop training programs for school personnel	Disseminate effective communications and communicate effectively
7. Involve students/staff in extended classroom experiences	Participate in community service activity	Provide publicity through professional presentations
8. Utilize research results in decision making	Apply research findings to new situations or in new settings	Apply data to program administration
9. Influence affective/ cognitive learning environment	Survey a climate for productive research	Practice effective group process techniques
10. Develop instructional models for future use	Obtain access to naturalistic settings for research purposes.	Develop interpersonal skills by interaction with other professionals
11. Acquire a cadre of professionals with expanded research skills.	Produce research leading to papers, symposia, grant proposals, and training activities	Acquire skills to become a resource and utilize other resources

(From Norris, Starrfield, and Hartwell, 1984)

Parker (1977) and others have pointed out that being part of a network has psychological advantages for participants as well as some of the more direct advantages listed by Norris and her colleagues. He said that participants feel a sense of shared purpose, and of being part of a special group (pp. 10-11). This kind of support was also reported by Goodlad (1975) in talking about the principals' response to the League of Schools project. Earlier we discussed at length the support gained by graduates through informal sponsorship networks and noted the efforts being made by women to gain the same benefits from their contemporary versions of "networking."

One of the gains that one or all of the participants in a collaboration may obtain is that of money. Usually this is spoken of as increased resources or covered up in some other kind of jargon, but occasionally an individual reporting on the results of such an effort will acknowledge it outright. Botel et al. (1984) mince no words in describing the benefits of a cooperative program to the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania. "First, there was significant monetary profit: the participants paid more than $175,000 in tuition" (p. 564).

Early collaborative efforts and those that continue today report that the partnerships allow the universities to support graduate students and faculty positions they would not otherwise be able to fund. Schools, too, benefit financially, obtaining training, curriculum development, and evaluation services, among other things, at lower than normal market rates. Shive (1984) puts it this way: "In a period of tight fiscal constraints

and increased demands for educational excellence, the school-college partnership concept has much untapped potential" (p. 122).

Sarason (1977) looks at the question of resource benefits differently. He doubts that there will ever be the resources some organizations seem to think they need to deal with their problems. However, he thinks that networks can help:

> agencies learn to exchange resources in mutually beneficial ways and without finances being a prerequisite for discussion or the basis for exchange. . . . What do I have that somebody else can use in exchange for something of his that I need? (pp. 21-22)

Danzberger and Usdan (1984) describe a benefit from the partnership in Atlanta that is not usually noted. They speak of the benefits of inclusion of higher education in that partnership and comment that

> In addition to helping the schools identify problems, generate research activities, and gather objective information, the connection with higher education has provided a mechanism through which to communicate with the business community. (p. 395)

Their contention is that the colleges were able to help because they had more experience working with the business community. While they may be right, a good case could be made for the opposite conclusion in Atlanta and in a number of other partnerships. Peterson (1985) describes the long history of interactions between the business community in Atlanta and the public schools. There, and in most communities, the reliance on a local tax base has developed within school districts a considerable skill at working with the local taxpayers--something that some higher education

institutions have historically been less directly involved with. Whether they are correct, it is likely that a partnership can expand the relationships with influential parties for all of its members.

The partnerships advocated by Goodlad are intended to promote change. Lieberman (1986b) concludes that "in many cases we find that change efforts have been successful due to some type of collaborative relations between the participating parties" (p. 5). Havelock, in two separate reports, speaks to the utility of networking to help with the exchange and diffusion of knowledge. In his 1981 case study of the Metropolitan School Study Council and in his 1973 Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education, he speaks of several different kinds of collaborative efforts and of their contribution to effecting change. Parker (1977) and others at the 1977 NIE conference on networking had different perspectives on the exact nature of networks, but agreed that such arrangements had the potential of facilitating change. Dalin (1977) has taken the analysis of the usefulness of networking as an aid to innovation further than most by developing the typology included in the Table 2.

Table 2
Relationship Between Types of Innovation and Purpose of Networks

	Network Purpose				
Type of Innovation	Political	Psycho-logical	Informa-tion	Skill	Resource
Technological	L	L	H	M	M
Behavioral	L	H	M	M	L
Organizational	M	H	L	H	L
Social	H	M	M	L	L

L = Low; M = Medium; H = High

(Dalin 1977, 74)

Thus, he is suggesting that if one wants to use a political network to make a technological change, little success is apt to be obtained. On the other hand, using a political network to achieve a social change is more apt to work than using a network of individuals with similar skills. Since school reform encompasses all four kinds of innovations, it would be necessary to develop five different types of networks, or to make sure that the network developed had the capabilities of all five types. To some extent the combining of the National Network for Educational Renewal with local school/university partnerships helps achieve those multi-purpose relationships. The National Network contributes psychological support for the local partnerships, provides information they need, makes available

consultants with skills needed by the local partnerships, and helps the locals with resources to permit their participation in network activities. The local partnerships differ as to which of the types they are. For example, the Puget Sound Educational Consortium seeks to exercise political strength, will share the skills of its staff members, has plans for information sharing and development, and intends to generate resources beyond the initial investment. While it has not deliberately identified psychological support as part of its aims, results from its first several years of operation suggest that the support provided administrators in the leadership seminar and principal institutes may be its most significant accomplishments to date. Thus, to some extent, in both of these instances the relationships represent all of the types of networks Dalin has described and, therefore, some progress in each of the different kinds of change can be predicted.

One of the specific purposes of school/university collaboration is the conduct of research. Several authors speak to gains they believe can be achieved through this approach to research. Lieberman (1986a) focuses on teams of school and university people created to engage in research and development. She describes six benefits that can come from such teams. These benefits are partially described below:

> Collaborative research and development creates a structure for teachers that facilitates reflection and action on the messiness of teaching and schooling problems.
>
> The team unites teachers and encourages collegial interaction. . . .
>
> Both the process of group interaction and the content of what is learned narrow the gap between "doing research" and "implementing research findings". . . .

> Naturally occurring problems that teachers have in their schools may lend themselves better to this type of research and development than large-scale funded research, as it can respect the time lines of the school people rather than the research grant.
>
> A collaborative team provides possibilities for teachers to assume new roles and exhibit leadership. . . .
>
> Collaborative research legitimates teachers' practical understanding and their definition of problems for both research and professional development. (p. 31)

So, If There Are So Many Benefits, Why Are There Not More Successful Partnerships?

In spite of the abundance of benefits demonstrated for cooperative efforts, there are obstacles to achieving success. One of the most commonly mentioned impediments is the notion that the two institutions are just plain incompatible. Martin Haberman (1971) identified twenty-three reasons why universities cannot educate teachers and listed as the first the impossibility of "college-lower school cooperation" (p. 33). He used the following analogy to help make his point:

> Slow-witted, lumbering elephants circle each other for a century only to discover that they are both males and incapable even of friendship. (p. 134)

He goes on, less metaphorically, asserting that

> Reports, books, and demonstration projects on how we cooperate have not affected any reality. . . . There are not budgetary, personnel, or other resources built into either institution that depend on cooperation; quite the contrary, the more either institution "cooperates," the more it costs and detracts from it own major purposes. (p. 134)

While our historical review and case studies might allow us to at least ask some questions about the notion that there is no financial benefit, Haberman's second reason why universities cannot educate teachers presents another impediment to school-university cooperation. He maintains, flatly, that personnel members in schools and colleges cannot work together. He says:

> Public school people regard college people as too theoretical and more concerned with analysis than solutions, not capable of working within legal structures, incapable of hard work during regularly scheduled business hours. College people perceive public school people as too conservative in accepting research or responding to great social problems; fearful of superiors; of lower intelligence, status, and education. . . . In truth, both groups are experts in maintaining their own organizations and espousing radical reforms in the other. [italics added] (p. 134)

While he may be overstating the case, there is no question that some of the people in these institutions do have the attitudes he accuses them of having, and these attitudes do get in the way of successful collaboration. Particularly troublesome is the notion that both school and college people know what is "best" for those in the other institutions. When collaboration is approached with this in mind--as it often is--defensive mechanisms are quickly raised.

Haberman's list does not stop with these two broadsides. He adds charges that college faculty is not capable of relating theory to practice, professional knowledge cannot be acted on in the lower schools, college leadership is not interested in the lower schools, and the public does not expect cooperative efforts. He adds that colleges cannot "change and

improve themselves and schools through research, demonstration, creative proposals, and dissemination programs" (p. 136). As he puts it:

> Government agencies and private foundations have placed universities in the role of "mover and shaker" only to end up in the same place at greater cost. After much time and money, there isn't a single example of school change which university faculty have researched and advocated that is now accepted as practice. . . . Any status survey will reveal that the proverbial third grade in Peoria grinds on pretty much as it did in 1910.
>
> Our record for self-change is even more dismal. (p. 136)

Before discounting these charges too quickly, consider the following:

> Studies reveal a marked discrepancy between the values dominant in teacher education courses and those more frequently found among practicing teachers [and] too few of the kinds of engagements we want young people to have with knowledge occur in the classroom setting. (Goodlad 1984, 192)

These remarks from A Place Called School are representative of a number of findings by Goodlad (1984) that support the notion that schools have changed little in the basic way teaching takes place in spite of the work done by universities. However, rather than demonstrate that school/university cooperation is useless, as Haberman suggests, these findings may help demonstrate why school/university cooperation as it has typically been practiced is not sufficient to bring about changes of the magnitude that are required.

If, however, we discount the notion that schools and universities are incompatible and assume that they are willing to keep searching for a means of effective collaboration, what obstacles are apt to be in the way?

University people in particular assert that one of the major obstacles to successful collaboration is the lack of reward for personnel members in higher education who become involved in such efforts. Haberman (1971), Wilbur (1985), Hathaway (1985), Havelock (1981), Sarason (1977), and Lieberman (1986b) are just some of the many who comment on this problem. What is seldom mentioned, but is true, is that there is little reward in the schools either.

The issue takes on particular importance for the college teacher because his or her promotion, academic respectability, and feelings of self-worth are entangled in a peer review system that offers financial rewards, tenure, and titles for selected kinds of professorial behaviors. Generally, in universities emphasis is placed on research and publication--not "service" or teaching. Lieberman (1986a) describes the problems this presents for college personnel:

> It is undervalued in the university because of an elitist view that values the problems and descriptions of researchers over those of practitioners. (p. 28)

There is no denying that the reward system poses problems for collaboration--at least in the minds of some individuals in the personnel of the university. Nevertheless, one is struck by the apparent lack of problems that researching in the field and performing consulting work provide for the personnel in other professional schools in the university. One hears few medical school faculty members complaining about lack of recognition for their work with surgery; few business school professors moaning about

lack of recognition for their time analyzing the practices of large corporations. Agricultural scholars developed the highly successful cooperative service programs that contributed greatly to the success (and downfall?) of the American farmer, but they are seldom heard to complain that working with extension services produces little recognition. It may be that part of the problem that individuals in the colleges of education have is that they see the work with the schools as "service" rather than viewing it as a really significant opportunity for research and publication. At times it almost seems as if they believe they can learn more about schools and schooling by reading what one of their peers has written about schools than by looking at schools.

But what about the lack of rewards for those in the school system? While individuals do not rely on similar peer ratings for promotions, they are subjected to review by superiors and lay boards regarding their success in accomplishing established priorities. This means, especially during times when finances are tight, that school people are not apt to want to continue something unless it is showing clear results. Havelock (1981) comments on the Metropolitan School Study Council:

> Most of the resources it provided were also offered by other network-like arrangements and service agencies which abounded in the region. Thus it was generally regarded by superintendents as pleasant, worthwhile, but rather inconsequential among the rich and varied assortment of in-service and linking opportunities available to them. There was no district for which it could be said to have provided a service which was either essential or one which could be provided from some other source. (p. 156)

Elsewhere he noted:

> For the school people and the superintendents in particular, the activities of the IOA were harder and harder to justify within very stringent budgets because they appeared to be mostly intellectual exercises with few clear and concrete school benefits either in terms of on-site technical advice or materials, or credits for professional upgrading. (p. 139)

The typical school salary structure does reward advanced training (as, for that matter, does the college system which places non-doctoral holding teachers in low-esteem, low paid roles) and this makes participation in collaborative efforts as a graduate student something that is rewarding for school employees. However, nothing is built into the school's reward system that makes participation in a cooperative venture any more valuable to an individual than any other activity. In fact, it may be seen by some as failing to pay attention to primary responsibilities--particularly if the collaboration threatens the status quo in the schools. School people are less likely to use this lack of recognition as an excuse for not committing to a collaborative effort--they tend to stress the lack of "concrete accomplishment," as Havelock noted above, as their way of dealing with the same issue.

Closely tied to the question of individual reward is the response of the institutions to collaboration. Havelock (1981), Huberman et al. (1981), Wilbur (1984), Sarason (1977), and others emphasize that institutions often place low priority on such interactions or feel them completely unnecessary. Sarason points out that:

> Agencies do not seek each other out for purposes of resource exchange; each agency sees itself as independent of all others, dependent only on its own subsidized resources to meet its goals, and energetically seeking new monies to purchase more resources. Each agency is an island, seeking ways to expand its land areas,

> fearing erosion from uncontrollable and unpredictable sources, and nurturing the fantasy that there must or there should exist the quantity and quality of resources that could ensure a safe and goal-fulfilling life. (p. 22)

It was this tendency that Seattle and the University of Washington College of Education had to overcome in instituting the collaboration described by Andrews and Soder (1985-86). In fact, this institutional view has to be overcome by any who would seek to form a true partnership.

Earlier we mentioned that college personnel members needed to overcome the notion that their work in the schools is a "service." Seeley (1981) is emphatic in his insistence that this view must be changed, not because of the university reward system but because he believes the service-delivery model is inappropriate for education. He argues as follows:

> The chief characteristic of partnership is common effort toward common goals. Partners may help one another in general or specific ways, but none is ever a client, because the relationship is mutual. Providers and clients can deal with one another at arm's length; partners share an enterprise, though their mutuality does not imply or require equality or similarity. Participants in effective partnerships may be strikingly different, each contributing to the common enterprise particular talents, experiences, and perspectives and sometimes having different status within the relationship and control over aspects of the work to be done.
>
> The concept of service delivery, unlike that of partnership, leads to conflict-producing ambiguities about whether provider or client wields more power in the relationship. "Client" is a word having two possible contradictory meanings: in one, it means "slave," "dependent". . . . In the other, it is a synonym for "patron," "employer". . . . Education has instances of both kinds of client relationships--neither one healthy. (p. 65)

The service-delivery model is not appropriate, although our review of the history of school/university relationships showed it to be one of the

most prevalent models; neither is a relationship in which one party controls the other. Davies and Aquino (1975) do an excellent job of describing the obstacles to improving teacher education caused by insistence by teacher organizations, administrative groups, colleges of education, and state departments of education, that each must be in control of the enterprise. Hathaway (1985) concludes from his review of the history of collaboration that "institutions of higher education have tended to exercise control over most joint LEA/IHE ventures in this country" (p. 7). Maeroff (1983) expresses concern about what he considers to be the traditional academic "pecking order" warning that "colleges and universities have had--for many years--a 'plantation mentality' about the schools" (p. 3). Seeley (1981) quotes former U.S. Representative Barbara Jordan, describing relationships in which one gives the appearance of collaboration but attempts to maintain control as "networks of illusions" (p. 73). By definition, the situation in which one party is in control of the other is not a partnership of the type we are seeking. If this prevails, resentment will build in the group being controlled.

Anderson and Davis, writing in Willer and Anderson (1981), point out the problem from their perspective as individuals concerned with exchange theory:

> How then are boundaries first crossed? One common situation is that socially marked status or power-differences exist between the persons or groups on one side of the boundary and those on the other. One group may, for instance, be seen by itself or by both parties as experts. Or one group may have higher traditional status than the other--be male and not female, professionals and not laypersons, or Mestizo and not Indian in Mexico. In such cases, the more powerful group or the group with higher status will assume that its discourse should naturally dominate in the

> dealings between the groups. It is up to the second group to learn and to accept the first group's taken-for-granted, to learn to understand its shorthand phrases and to formulate the situations that come up in the categories in its terminology. In the long run, the powerless or lower-status group may resent the hegemony and force a change if its consciousness has been raised, but we are speaking here about the arrangements that are likely to prevail initially. If the transactions are made to occur on the physical premises of the powerful or higher-status group, the dominance of its code is most easily assured. (p. 21)

The boundaries between the cultures of the schools and universities may be initially crossed by one or the other, assuming it is in the controlling position, but the cost in terms of future good will and cooperation could be great. Perhaps, equally difficult, could be the situation in which each party assumes it is dominant and seeks to control the other. In that not-unlikely scenario, one is reminded of Haberman's elephants fruitlessly circling each other and can expect little to come of the confrontation.

Many network theorists, including Sarason (1977), Lortie (1977), Huberman (1982) and Miles (1977), express concern about relationships becoming too formalized. They warn that the advantages claimed for network interaction are derived from knowledge of natural relationships and that too much or too quick efforts to formalize and codify such relationships will create for these relationships all of the problems experienced by large bureaucracies. Sarason (1977) in particular expresses concern about possible negative consequences of legislating networks (p. 181). This warning is particularly appropriate in light of recent attempts by a number of states to legislate cooperation as part of their school reform plans. Maeroff (1983) warns against focusing on the machinery of school/university

relationships, saying that "Time and time again, when people think about collaboration they focus on budgets and bureaucracy . . . this, of course is self-defeating" (p. 5).

One obstacle that has had less attention than some of the others in the literature may have more influence than many of the participants in collaboration realize. Smith (1977) points to the effects of external contexts. She describes the way political agendas by a governor became a part of the decision matrix for a partnership involving education in the arts. While others have been previously cited as pointing out that the environment may drive the schools and universities to collaborate in order to survive, relatively little attention has been given to the potentially significant affects of the context on the ongoing operation of a school/university partnership. Obviously, significant shifts in funding will have an affect, but what of major changes in the national political scene, or in social movements? For example, can anyone doubt that the focus of school/university interaction was drastically changed by the civil rights disorders of the late 1960s?

Others discussing obstacles, speak to the differences between the schools and universities--not as indications that they are incompatible, just that their differences may not be adequately recognized by participants and thus produce conflict. Lortie (1977) calls attention to the differences in the ways policy is made in the two institutions. Wu (1985) provides a three-page listing, noting differences in how the two institutions deal with such diverse matters as research, control, policy making,

personnel matters, public criticism, and expenditures of funds. Sarason has frequently written and spoken about the differences in the cultures of the two institutions and how unaware participants in one are of the life in the other.

Hathaway (1985), citing Richards, lists 18 obstacles that are particularly a problem for collaborative research efforts, some of which we have mentioned previously:

1. Lack of perceived relevance of university research to school needs and interest.
2. Naive or poor quality designs of research proposed to school districts.
3. Poor implementation by often badly trained student testers or research assistants.
4. Failure on the part of the researchers to report back on results to the system or to individual participants.
5. Researchers making recommendations and directions which are in conflict with the values, goals, and policies of the school.
6. Disagreement between school and university on the purpose of research.
7. Misunderstanding on the part of both institutions on the other institution's capabilities, purposes, organizational procedures, behavior, language, or subcultural characteristics.
8. An "ivory tower" attitude on the part of university professors toward school teachers and district educators, matched by a suspicion on the part of school teachers and administrators toward university professors.
9. The high level of bureaucratization and dispersal of power in school systems.
10. Differing time schedules of schools and research projects.
11. Lack of school teacher and administrator training in research methods.

12. The tendency of universities to promote complicated funded projects.

13. Universities failing to consult with school district personnel before designing a research project.

14. Universities commanding complete control over the workings of a research project.

15. Failure of school districts to set forth clear operational procedures for conducting research.

16. School district administrators' attitude that research is superficial.

17. Researchers' reliance on technical jargon when explaining a project which may be unfamiliar to school district personnel.

18. Researchers' invasion and disruption of classrooms to conduct research. (pp. 9-10)

What Will Produce Success?

There are many obstacles in the path of securing the numerous benefits promised from collaboration. Some of the suggestions for making collaboration successful simply tell schools and universities to overcome the obstacles. In addition there are other suggestions for what it takes to produce success coming from those who have studied networks and other forms of collaboration.

Many of the authors have provided summary lists of what they believe is necessary for collaborations to succeed. Interestingly, our review of case studies, the history of school/university relations, and other writings on the subject suggest that a major consideration in achieving satisfactory

results is an ingredient not commonly found in the summary lists. This ingredient is best described by Sarason (1977) as he talks about Mrs. Dewar, whom he credits with initiating the Essex type network that he describes in his analysis. He says:

> To start an Essex-type network requires a person who is perceived as important in some way, who is known to many people, and who has persistence. . . . We would contend that it was her ideas, far more than affluence and status, that made the difference between the network's viability and an early demise. (p. 105)

In addition to noting the importance of her ideas, he cites her persistence as a key ingredient. Later, he discusses another network and finds a person acting in a role similar to that of Mrs. Dewar.

The partnership between Queen's College and the Louis Armstrong School had several people in key leadership roles, but clearly owes much of its success to Sidney Trubowitz. The Partnership at UCLA and the Puget Sound Educational Consortium can identify numerous individuals who played roles in their creation, but likely most would admit to the central role of John Goodlad and his ideas and persistence in functioning as their Mrs. Dewar. In Little Rock, Arkansas, in a collaboration mentioned only briefly before, Sara Murphy functions as if she were Mrs. Dewar's reincarnation. The long history of the Metropolitan School Study Council reveals that it flourished under the inspiration of Paul Mort, Paul Vincent, and Ann Lieberman, but struggled when it did not have the benefit of the ideas and persistence of its own versions of Mrs. Dewar. Peterson (1977) observes that successful collaborations often are initiated by a particular innovator who becomes

their first leader. In short, it appears that a partnership is much more likely to be successful if it has leadership from a Mrs. Dewar whose ideas and persistence will provoke the kinds of interactions that are necessary to overcome the many obstacles present and secure for the collaboration the benefits that can from such arrangements.

The purpose of a relationship also helps determine its success. However, the experts have mixed recommendations concerning whether the purpose should be narrow and specifically defined or broad and multi-faceted. Hathaway (1985), Shive (1984), Peterson (1977), and Maeroff (1983) are among those who argue for sharply focused efforts. On the other hand, Dalin (1977), Parker (1977), and Schon (1977) suggest in varying ways that a multi-purpose network may have better chance for survival. In any event, all agree that clarity of purpose is necessary. At the same time, several authorities warn against getting hung up on defining goals.

Lieberman (1986b) stresses the importance of paying attention to activities, not goals, in initiating a collaboration. Wilbur (1985) and Maeroff (1983) add their emphasis to this by stressing the importance of focusing on action and not machinery in the early stages of collaboration. While it is important to get on with the action, there is still a need to provide for adequate coordination of certain key variables.

Wu (1985) specifies the need to provide for the management of conflict, while Shive (1984), Mahlios and Carpenter (1982), and Lieberman (1986b) discuss the importance of clarifying and coordinating the roles of differ-

ent participants. The three case studies completed by Havelock, Miles, and Huberman also clearly demonstrate the need for such clarification and coordination (see Havelock et al. 1982).

Making sure that there are adequate resources is another necessary action. Hathaway (1985) and Shive (1984) speak to the need for adequate funding and the necessity of pooling funds. Each of the case studies reviewed spoke in one way or the other to this aspect of collaboration. Some reviewers have pointed out that it is not just a question of whether there are adequate funds. If these funds are controlled by one of the parties in the collaboration instead of shared, adverse relationships may develop. Time is another important resource. Schon (1977) points out that if there is not sufficient slack in the schedules of would-be collaborators, they will not get together sufficiently to build the necessary bridges. Shive (1984) and Lieberman (1986b) also speak to the importance of providing sufficient time to accomplish the interactions that are needed.

In speaking of obstacles, we mentioned the problems of lack of reward and recognition of individuals in schools and colleges for collaborative activities. Not surprisingly, many authorities speak to this issue. Wilbur (1985), Hathaway (1985), Havelock (1981), Havelock et al. (1982), Goodlad (1975), Lieberman (1986b), Shive (1984), Maeroff (1983), and Parkay (1986) are among those making the point. Parkay speaks more directly to the need for recognition of people in the school than most of the others who tend to focus on the problem in the universities. Interestingly, with

the exception of Haberman (1971), most of these writers express the belief that such rewards can be found; at the same time they acknowledge that the systems functioning as they now do will not provide recognition to collaborators. Several authorities, including Wilbur (1985) and Hathaway (1985), speak to a variation on this theme when they emphasize the importance of the support from the top administration in the institutions. This was one of the findings from his work with The League of Cooperating Schools, that led Goodlad to conclude that school districts, not just schools, needed to be involved in the school/university relationships. It is also a condition that he has imposed on each of the local partnerships who seek admission to the National Network for Educational Renewal. Recognition of individual effort in a collaboration is much more apt to be obtained if the institutions' leaders are committed to the collaboration.

In the very definition of partnerships of the type we are discussing, an explicit condition for success is the recognition by the parties of each others' mutual needs. Wilbur (1985), Hathaway (1985), and Maeroff (1983) are among those who identify this as an essential condition for success in collaboration.

Sarason (1982) has written and spoken eloquently of the need for the participants to understand the culture of the parties involved in a collaborative effort. Hathaway (1985) and Lieberman (1986b) are among others who have suggested this as a condition for success in collaboration. As this is considered, it becomes evident that, in addition to a Mrs. Dewar, school/university partnerships need intermediate engineers of the type

described by Goodlad (Smith et al. 1966). In developing The Partnership in Southern California, it is apparent that Paul Heckman was at least one individual who could play that role. Havelock's recital of the history of the Metropolitan School Study Council and Huberman's Midwestern State Case, as well as his review of the Teachers' Center Exchange, reveal individuals successfully filling this responsibility. These are people who are knowledgeable enough of the cultures of all the participants in a collaboration to move freely between them, translating the language, understanding the reward systems, translating the ideas of those in one culture to those in another. Of course, to some extent, these are the liaison positions described in classical network theory--the boundary spanners who permit otherwise independent entities to establish effective links. In seeking such individuals, care should be taken to find those who can meet the demands of the role. Allen (1977) warns that:

> When the organization is concerned with innovation and is itself contributing to technological advance the gatekeeper provides the most effective link between the organization's efforts and those being pursued elsewhere. . . .
>
> Practitioners, who are not themselves innovators or at least making some research contribution, would be excluded. This means that for the vast majority of those involved in education the gatekeeper cannot be assumed to provide access to current technology. (pp. 13-14)

As Goodlad noted, such individuals are hard to find.

Several other suggestions receive repeated attention. For example, shared ownership of problems is urged, participants are reminded to provide training if new skills are needed for the collaboration, individuals are

warned to expect problems, and collaborators are encouraged to recognize that they can achieve more together than they can by working alone.

A point made by Parkay (1986), by Goodlad on numerous occasions, and by some of the other authorities is that success is more apt to be achieved if the university concentrates on working with the schools on processes, than if the effort is made to impose a particular solution from the university onto the school.

Finally, if we consider the case studies of Havelock et al. (1982) and Huberman ((1981), the analysis of networks by Turk (1970), and other writings, we will recognize the essentialness of learning from the past in dealing with these collaborations. Many of the mistakes and problems experienced by schools and universities as they seek to work together could be alleviated if participants were aware of prior relationships and of attitudes that those relationships may have created.

VI. IMPLICATIONS FOR STUDY AND ACTION

We began by noting that imprecise terms are used to describe school/university relationships. This imprecision is due, in part, to the varied aims that schools and universities have had as they sought out each other for collaboration. It is also undoubtedly present because the historical domination of schools by universities has often been accompanied by rhetoric that sought to describe a mutuality in the relationship that was impossible because of the intention of one agency to control (or at least dominate) the other. There have been many interactions between these two kinds of educational institutions, and the history of these relationships can provide insight into future cooperative efforts. As rich as this history is, there remain many significant unanswered questions that those concerned must examine if the potential of school/university relationships is to be fully recognized. In this section of the monograph, some of these implications are identified with the hope that others will examine them and provide answers that can help us realize the full potential of such partnerships.

This review of the literature has uncovered relatively little in the way of third-party observations about relationships. Most of the reports about networks and collaborations have been written by participants; and then, not surprisingly, by participants based in the universities. As has been noted, the three case studies by Havelock, Huberman, and their

colleagues are exceptions to this. Also, there is some third-party data concerning the Willamette Valley Consortium in Oregon, efforts at networking Teacher Centers, and the Queens College/Louis Armstrong Middle School partnership in New York. However, if questions such as those discussed in this section are to be answered, much more data will have to be collected and reported about how such relationships are formed and what happens once they are operational.

As has been mentioned several times, too many of the partnerships attempt to operate without a clear sense of the history of relationships between participants. Those who would engage in partnerships would be well advised to familiarize themselves with the precedent of interaction involving their agencies. Beyond that, we need information about the kinds of historical conditions that are most apt to provide fertile ground for new types of relationships. Also, we need to know what activities appear to have been successful in overcoming apparent historical barriers to successful collaboration.

One major question that needs extensive investigation is one that has been discussed as the Mrs. Dewar principle. The presence of a committed, ideologically strong leader among the initiators of the relationship appears to be absolutely essential. We need to know more about what motivates these leaders, how those who create strong collaborations differ from those who try and fail, what processes they use to initiate and sustain relationships, and whether the Mrs. Dewars can be identified and inserted into a situation in order to initiate collaboration from outside a proposed relationship.

Closely related to questions about the qualities of leadership needed for successful relations is the question of what it takes to sustain these relationships when they lose their Mrs. Dewar. The history of the Metropolitan School Study Council and The Partnership at UCLA provide some clues to the difficulty of sustaining relationships beyond the term of the initiating leaders. More data from more relationships are needed if generalizations are to be made about this issue.

The boundary spanners, intermediate engineers, liaisons--those people who can move back and forth between the schools and the university and who have an understanding of both cultures--also need more study. There is almost no data that is directly related to the role of such individuals in school/university relationships; yet most persons commenting on the scene recognize the importance of that data. Are there academic qualifications? Must they have work experience in both camps? What do those individuals who succeed in this role do as they interact with people in the schools and universities? Can such individuals be deliberately cultivated?

Another question that is very fundamental to the potential of school/university relationships--and to the broader question of the role of the university in studying education--is the efficacy of research. Can research inform practice? Eisner (1984) and Baker (1984) are among the many who have debated that issue. If there is little in the research findings of the educational scholar that has utility for the practitioner, then there is little reason to pursue relationships--regardless of the kind of relationship. Still unanswered is the related question of the utility

of such relationships for facilitating significant change. Although many claim the power of change for such relationships, there are few demonstrations of successful change resulting from known relationships.

As noted earlier, there is a difference of opinion within the literature concerning whether such relationships should have broad or narrow purposes. As further study is conducted we need to make deliberate efforts to compare collaborations using this dimension. It may be that purpose is not as critical as the nature of the activities employed to accomplish the stated purpose(s). That is, it may be that either numerous loosely related activities or a few closely related activities represent the better strategy for success in school/university relationships. A review of more detailed cases should enable us to clarify both issues.

Since one of the most common obstacles to success of these relationships is reported to be the lack of reward for participants, particularly those from the universities, we should study ways of assuring appropriate reward for individuals involved. The frustrations continually expressed by college professors who see school involvement as outside of the mainstream of professional work, and the obvious insult conveyed by providing a "master teacher" with forty or fifty dollars to work with a student teacher for a nine-week period are just examples of the problems in this regard. We need to develop models of research that demonstrate that valid scholarship can grow out of school-based study, and we need to develop appropriately salaried clinical positions to assist with the field preparation of educators. Moreover, this reward system must extend beyond the colleges of

education into the Arts and Sciences so that the full resources of the university can be incorporated into the partnerships.

Too little information is available concerning the comparative cultures of schools and universities. Without a better understanding of the differences and similarities of the contexts in which educators in these two kinds of organizations work, we will not be able to achieve full cooperation in relationships. Perhaps we need to seek models that will enable us to make the understanding of the school culture as important to the college professor as is understanding the university culture--and the reverse for the school professional. Comparisons of values, language, myths, roles played by various participants, and reward structures are some of the topics that need to be examined. But the examination must be a comparative one--one in which the characteristic of one agency are explained in terms of its likeness to the other agency.

Ultimately, as we continue to study these relationships, we may find that we are watching two dinosaurs (not elephants) circling each other. We may watch as schools and universities parry and thrust, while other entities emerge as the providers of education and the trainers of those who educate. If such is the case, it is likely to be only because we fail to understand the potential of school/university collaboration, because we do not obtain the answers to these critical questions about such relationships, or because we do not capitalize on what is already known about how obstacles can be overcome to achieve success within these relationships. These partnerships will not be created by university people preoccupied

with the need for personal promotion. Neither will they be developed by school people worried about professional survival in the bureaucracy of the school system. They will develop and flourish only if created and worked by educators who are willing and able to set aside personal ambitions for the satisfaction of the self-interests of others with whom they are working. They will be of value only to the extent that all parties seek to use them for the simultaneous reform and renewal of schools and universities.

APPENDIX A

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gathered and Prepared by Patricia Hammill

Andrews, Richard L. and Roger Soder. "University/District Collaboration on Effective Schools." National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision 2, No. 3 (1985-86): 33-48.

This article commences with the discussion of a conceptual framework for analyzing the collaborative model. The trend in recent years by organizational theorists from viewing organizations as rational systems to considering them as open systems is reviewed within a historical context. The management of change from an open-systems perspective is highlighted, with Weick's tight/loose coupling model as organizer. A case history of the development of a collaborative relationship between a university and a school district is given, and the responses of the involved personnel members to the process and outcomes of the collaborative effort are reported. Weick's tight/loose coupling model is then used to analyze this particular example of university/school district collaboration.

Clark, E. D. "A Conceptual Basis for Collaboration." Emerging Concepts for Collaboration. Buletin No. 40, Association of Teacher Educators, Washington, D.C., 1975, pp. 1-17.

Teacher education is used as an organizer for this discussion of collaborative efforts between universities and public schools. The author elucidates the relationship of acquisition of theoretical knowledge ("knowing that") to the ability to translate that knowledge into informed action ("knowing how"). He proposes a five-level structure to guide the student teaching experience, which insures integration of theoretical knowledge and practical application.

Comer, James P. "Toward School Improvement: A Study of Collaborative Relationships Between Universities and Public Schools." Final Report to National Institute of Education (NIE-G-80-0044), 1981.

This study focused on three school/university projects that were aimed at improving elementary education programs in the New Haven School District. Through intensive interviewing of project participants and the analysis of documents, the investigators sought to discover commonalities among these projects in order to contribute to knowledge about the nature of school/university collaborative efforts. The projects included the Yale Child Study Center Schools Program, the Bank Street College of Education Follow Through Program, and the University of Connecticut Leadership Training Program.

The study sought to describe the collaborative process in these three projects and to identify factors that were associated with that process. The factors included in the investigation were: nature of reward systems, involvement of central administration, nature of participation (voluntary of involuntary), prior experience in collaborative efforts, prior training of participants, and institutional pressures of participating groups.

Two factors that predominated as crucial to the success of the collaborative efforts were: the individual personalities of the collaborators and the involvement of the central administration of the school system. [The above annotation is quoted in major part from the introduction to the Final Report.]

Comer, James P. "Demand for Excellence and the Need for Equity: The Dynamics of Collaboration." Chapter XIII in Education in Schools and Nonschool Settings, Eighty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1 (pp. 245-263), edited by Mario D. Fantini and Robert I. Sinclair. Chicago: N.S.S.E. Publication, 1985.

In this N.S.S.E. Yearbook chapter, Comer develops a framework for discussiong the benefits of collaboration among social and behavioral scientists, educators, parents, and community groups by reviewing the dynamics of change and social equity within a historical context., Central to his discussion is the idea that "After the 1940s and particularly in the last several decades, science-based and technology-based changes, and related social changes, have made educational and social equity largely interdependent" (p. 245). In addition, he states, scientific and technological change, with related social change, have broken the "natural collaboration" between home, school, and community which once existed in our society.

Comer sees four levels of collaboration as critical for the improvement of American school system: (1) collaboration between educators and social and behavioral scientists; (2) collaboration between colleges and universities, and primary and secondary schools; (3) collaboration between the central office of a particular school system and its individual schools; and (4) collaboration among the participants in the educational process at the building level--parents, the staff, and students.

Obstacles to collaboration are discussed, as well as requirements for successful collaborative efforts. The historical development and structure

of the New Haven Model is described, an example of one type of collaboration that is aimed at reducing behavior problems, increasing academic gains, improving classroom climate, and helping low-income children develop interactional skills.

The author stresses the importance of contextual variables in the development of a collaborative process. He suggests that there are many issues involved and changes required in promoting educational excellence that cannot be simply identified and then mandated. Many of these issues are "human factors"--that is, what people are like under various social conditions. "An educational program of excellence and equity," the author concludes, "requires a collaborative system that understands the 'human factors' and facilitates interaction which results in optimal performance of all involved (p. 262).

Devaney, Kathleen. Networking on Purpose: A Reflection Study of the Teachers' Centers Exchange. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1982.

In this work, Devaney reviews the development and growth of the Teachers' Centers Exchange, a national information and referral center for and about teachers' centers. With support of the National Institute of Education, the exchange personnel sets out to show that "simulating and organizing a spontaneously formed informal network could produce an effective medium for communicating information and expertise about some kinds of knowledge and inventions" (p. 9). An underlying notion existed

that a network can be an effective dissemination and technical assistance tool when:

1. inquirers are not seeking scientific proof of outcomes but want to see and hear for themselves examples of practice that is sustained because of self-evident success;

2. the "data base" or expertise thus is not research findings or model specifications but "craft knowledge" mainly possessed by and being constantly adapted by skillful practitioners;

3. the data-processing thus is not a matter of final selection toward a preferred model but rather a collection of many forms of practice;

4. the communications process thus is not a matter of dissemination or delivery from an official source but of dialogue among participants. (p. 9)

The emphasis throughout is on informal, face-to-face communication as opposed to formal, bureaucratically belabored interchanges.

Devaney has given an overview of the exchange that delineates its structure and functions, discusses the origins and development of the network and the exchange from a reflective stance, and deals with the issues of communication style, management, and the problem of balance within the organization.

A review of the exchange, written by Michael Huberman, is also included which provides theoretical bases for examining the functions of the exchange in a particular sense and networks in general.

This work concludes with five appendixes that provide the reader with rich sources of information concerning exchange members (i.e., Teachers' Centers in the Network) throughout the United States, publications available, the structures of mini-awards and work parties, and examples of the type of documentation utilized between exchange and teacher center staffs over a period of several years.

Gehrke, Nathalie J. and Walter C. Parker. "Collaboration in Staff Development: Variations on the Concept." NASSP Bulletin 67, No. 461 (March 1983): 50-54.

Gehrke and Parker identify two forms of collaborative planning. Egalitarian collaboration is characterized by pure collective initiation, planning, and implementation, with all of the involved parties exhibiting similar roles and responsibilities in all facets of change. Its distinguishing characteristic is parity. Dialectical collaboration, on the other hand, is distinguished by an integration of the top-down, grassroots, and joint-planning modes. The key difference between dialectical and egalitarian collaboration is that the dialectical model integrates the three planning modes, while the egalitarian model uses joint planning in an attempt to overcome the limitations of the other two.

With the case study of a staff development program that utilized the dialectical model as a basis for discussion, the authors suggest that both models of collaboration work, but that one might be more appropriate than the other in certain contexts. A common need of the key layers of project

personnel members--that is, those who administer the project and those whose behavior is to be changed--is a subjective experience of being in control. Both models of collaboration respect that need; consequently, both models are likely to be more effective than the exclusive use of either grassroots or top-down planning.

The authors suggest that the egalitarian model may be more effective in small school districts or small projects within large districts where it is feasible for a large percentage of project participants to be directly involved in planning. The dialectical model, with its alternating use of the strengths of the grassroots, the top, and the whole, may be more functional in the large district because it is likely to allow a sufficient subjective experience of control.

Goodlad, John I. "Networking and Educational Improvement: Reflections on a Strategy." Paper prepared for the Network Development Staff, School Capacity for Problem Solving Group, National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., March 1977. (ERIC No. ED 180 433)

The experiences associated with the nascence and maturation of the League of Cooperating Schools (L.C.S.) is the focus of this paper by Goodlad. The relationships involved in this formal network of eighteen elementary schools in Southern California and the Research Division of the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc. (I/D/E/A) were cultivated over a period of six years. These experiences provided the opportunity for a large-scale inquiry into educational change, using the consortium of schools as the laboratory for both implementing a strategy

and studying its development. Project initiators envisioned, with the development of the league, a new social system that could, over time, be massaged into a functioning entity.

The narrative recounts the development of the project from its beginning, with emphasis on the roles of the involved school principals, the individual school as the key unit for educational change, and the professional growth of school faculty members. A description of the development of the project newsletter, which helped to increase network communication, is given.

Observations on the effectiveness of the strategy and the functioning of its several components are interspersed throughout the paper, and recommendations appear in the context of the topic discussed. A final section is devoted to observations, conclusions, and generalizations based on the content of the narrative.

Goodlad, John I. "Toward a More Perfect Union." State Education Leadership. Denver: Publication of the Education Commission of the States, May 1986.

A short verson of an unpublished paper, "Partnerships for Educational Change" might well serve as a subtitle for this article by Goodlad. The characteristics of partnerships are reviewed, and the typical uses of the term in relation to education are discussed. A crucial feature of a successful partnership is symbiosis, defined here as the uniting of "unlike

entities rather intimately in mutually beneficial relationships." Therefore, relations in which one (or more) of the parties assumes a benefactor role or noblesse oblige stance are not partnerships as defined by Goodlad. Likewise, the term partnerships has been used to describe what are essentially networks of similar institutions, like schools or school districts. Such relationships tend not to bring about effective change due to minor demands on time and energy.

Goodlad calls for a restructuring of traditional networks into more formalized, purposeful partnerships to allow for the in-depth reorganization of educational institutions that he views as imperative. Attention is focused on the development of school/university partnerships that would promote change not only in the schools but also in the universities--particularly where the training of teachers is concerned. The author envisions that with the establishment of such "true partnership(s)" based on symbiotic relationships "the result could be the redesign of existing institutions or the creation of new ones."

Haberman, Martin. "Twenty-Three Reasons Why Universities Can't Educate Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education 22 (1971): 133-140.

Haberman discusses twenty-three assumptions about teacher education that he claims are uncritically accepted and that perpetuate "the delusion that teachers can be educated for the real world in colleges universities." It is the author's contention that school/university cooperation is not possible due to institutional differences, and that personality and value

systems of the personnel in the two institutions are so different that it makes working together difficult, if not impossible. In addition, the author refutes the notion that colleges can change and improve themselves and schools through research, demonstration, creative proposals, and dissemination programs. He states that "After much time and money, there isn't a single example of school change which university faculty have researched and advocated that is not accepted practice," and furthermore, "Our [university] record for self-change is even more dismal." In addition, he claims that it is a myth that the public sees and expects a cooperative relationship between colleges and lower schools because relationships are conceived in individual, not organizational, terms. He also argues that the situations in which graduates subsequently operate have more influence over teachers' performance than have skills, values, and theory acquired in the college classroom. In sum, he states: "Present forms of schooling not only don't solve critical social problems, they cause and contribute to them."

Hathaway, Walter E. "Models of School-University Collaboration: National and Local Perspectives on Collaborations That Work." Paper presented for Symposium at the Annual Meeting of AERA, Chicago, March 1985. (ED 253 973)

Starting with the premise that improved collaboration of elementary and secondary school systems with universities and colleges is essential not only to the improvement of education but to its survival, the author summarizes issues pertinent to school/university collaboration in such

areas as basic research and evaluation, staff development, sharing of expertise, and service to clients. Other areas summarized by the author include: (1) the history of collaboration between school systems and institutions of higher education, (2) the fundamental issue of control in collaboration between schools and colleges, (3) obstacles to collaboration, (4) models for organizing joint efforts, (5) examples of successful efforts across the country, and (6) possible guidelines for implementing a collaboration.

Hechinger, Fred M. "School-College Collaboration: An Essential to Improved Public Education." NAASP Bulletin, October 1984, pp. 69-79.

It is this author's contention that "the most serious area in which the colleges have failed in the past has been in their task of providing the kind of teachers that are needed for better schools." He argues that school reforms will fail unless colleges address the problem of teacher education. He proposes that a substantial part of the teacher training process should be moved out of the teachers college campuses and into the schools. College faculties and experienced school teachers should work together to train a new category of teachers who will continue to be in touch with the field and the university.

Hord, Shirley M. "A Synthesis of Research on Organizational Collaboration." Educational Leadership 43, No. 5 (February 1986): 22-26

Hord initiates her synthesis with the assertion that it is necessary to distinguish cooperation from collaboration, as each is a distinct process yielding different results. In exploring the literature on collaborative and cooperative efforts, she examined concepts and paradigms of individual, organizational, and interorganizational behavior, as well as case studies of agencies and institutions that cooperated, coordinated, collaborated, or consorted. Characteristics of the processes delineated above are examined, as well as the prerequisite conditions for such processes to take place. Central to Hord's discussion is the notion that collaboration involves more time, effort, and commitment from both or all parties than does cooperation since activities are shared rather than simply allowed.

Hord has developed preliminary models for explicating the processes of cooperation and collaboration. She concludes by stating that further research is needed that undertakes comparative studies of cooperation, coordination, collaboration, and other forms of interrelational activity.

Huberman, A. M. School-University Collaboration Supporting School Improvement, vol. 1, The Midwestern State Teacher Center Network Case. Washington, D.C.: American University, Center for Technology and Administration, Knowledge Transfer Institute, June 1981. Sponsoring Agency: National Institute of Education (NIE Contract No. 400-79=0063) (ERIC ED 210 260).

This work by Huberman is a case study of an interorganizational arrangement involving collaboration among a college of education, intermediary service agencies, and a collection of schools or school districts. The relationships among partners in the arrangement are analyzed with a focus on linking mechanisms and boundary-spanning roles. The Statewide Teacher Center Network--and two of its constituent members, Arcadia Teacher Center and the Three Rivers Teacher Center--are examined in this study. All are located in a large, sparsely populated midwestern state. Each of the two centers acted as an intermediary, linking a college of education with surrounding school districts and counties. A description is given of the origins of Statewide Teacher Center Network and of the Arcadia and Three Rivers Centers. In describing the first two years of collaborations among these institutions, consideration is given to events and activities, available resources, objectives, key persons, barriers and facilitators, and the dynamics of interaction between the institutions. The present collaborative effort is examined, focusing on the main events and institutional context, structure and procedures, changes in objectives, and resource changes. A discussion is presented of the outcomes of the collaborative effort and possibilities for the future. Profiles are given of specific projects at the Arcadia and Three Rivers Centers. Diagrams are

presented of the factors that appeared to account for the outcomes obtained in each of the centers studied.

[The above annotation is quoted in major part from the Abstract of ERIC Document #ED 210 260.)

Huberman, Michael. "Making Changes from Exchanges: Some Frameworks for Studying the Teachers' Centers Exchange." In Networking on Purpose, edited by K. Devaney. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory, 1982.

Huberman's review and analysis of the Teachers' Centers Exchange is eclectic in nature. He has drawn from Teachers' Centers Exchange documents, other studies evaluating the exchange, and the body of theory and empirical research belonging to the general family of "knowledge dissemination and use." Network theory, communication theory, knowledge transfer and linkage theory, models of the educational innovation process, and organization and interorganization theory provide frameworks for analyzing different aspects of the Teachers' Centers Exchange. In addition, Huberman draws heavily on the work of Havelock (1969) and his own recent work (done in collaboration with Havelock and Miles) in the field of educational knowledge dissemination and use.

Huberman's analysis suggests that the localist and lateral approach of affiliated teachers' centers could constitute an alternative to existing dissemination approaches. Good linkage--dense, multiplex, and reciprocal links between users and center-mediated resources--ensures availability and continuity. Local adaptiveness appears to be enhanced with user-centered-

ness, together with a counseling approach to meeting users' needs. In addition, peer networking, with access to super-peers, provides craft legitimization. Finally, leadership at strong centers seems to give an inspirational thrust.

The Exchange (the network of local centers) helps provide significantly more "effective inputs" (information and expertise delivery in teacher-usable forms) than the centers would deliver without the exchange. The "Exchange operates as a decentralized and lateral network, as person-mediated, as counter-bureaucratic, as oftentimes a collection of like-minded souls, and that, as a result it is such intangibles as a sense of community, commitment, consideration, and the experience of personal growth that are the kind of variables that make the whole enterprise work."

Huberman, A. Michael, Nanette S. Levinson, Ronald G Havelock, and Pat L. Cox. "Interorganizational Arrangements: An Approach to Educational Practice Improvement." Knowledge 3, No. 1 (September 1981): 5-22.

"Knowledge transfer in Formal Interorganizational Arrangements to Improve Educational Practice" is the subtitle and focus of this theoretical work by Huberman et al. The authors acknowledge the schism that exists between university theoreticians and school-embedded practitioners which they claim often boils down to distinctions between concerns for understanding, as opposed to concerns for action. They assert that more attention needs to be paid to the types of knowledge transferred between universities and schools, as well as to the direction of transfer. They

also indicate that initial work on knowledge utilization theory suggests that knowledge transfer in education is far more complex--and far less manageable in the ways that it is politically and socially mediated between and within collaborating institutions--than is the case in such areas as agriculture or engineering.

The authors propose an approach that integrates relevance concepts from organizational, interorganizational exchange, and power-dependency theories into a knowledge transfer paradigm, allowing for a more powerful understanding of knowledge transfer in complex social settings than has been yielded by single-disciplinary approaches. In addition, it is suggested that there are some characteristics of interorganizational arrangements that appear to bode well for optimal knowledge dissemination and use in education, including presence of superordinate goals, congruence of purpose, symmetry in the distribution of power (especially in domains that no organization has claimed as its exclusive preserve), presence of boundary-spanning roles, and relations between collaborating units that are characterized by intensity, reciprocity, clarity of exectations, and multiplexity of ties. Suggestions for methodological approaches include techniques of mapping knowledge flows and use of the serial analytic technique to maintain a data base that is dynamic and integral.

Lieberman, Ann. "Collaborative Work." Educational Leadership, February 1986, pp. 4-8.

In this article, Lieberman discusses the potential benefits of collaboration in school reform efforts. While some research has systematically documented the complex process of school change, practical experience in school improvement far outweighs systematic study. In many cases, change efforts have been successful due to collaborative relations among the participating parties. Studies of successful schools indicate that they are people-centered organizations in which teachers have maximum autonomy to do their work, but are collectively engaged in dialogue about the central problems of the school.

Lieberman employs a definition of collaboration that is broad enough to encompass two teachers working toward shared responsibilities; school improvement teams in a school or district; principal and teacher centers; university/school collaborations; and foundations, statewide efforts, and national reform groups.

Three examples of collaborative work are given which lend a sense of breadth and depth of current collaborative work: Maine's state-wide school improvement program, a university/school collaboration, and a district-wide group of first-grade teachers in South Bend, Indiana.

Lieberman stresses that while the idea of collaborating is attractive, it is in reality a difficult and complex process. Those who have practiced and written about collaborative efforts can help us to understand some of these complexities.

Maeroff, Gene I. School and College: Partnerships in Education. A Carnegie Foundation Special Report. (Foreword by Ernest L. Boyer). Princeton, N. J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983.

This special report was to be the first of a new series inaugurated by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The work reports in-depth the development and evolution of a number of collaborative school/college relationships around the country. Chapters I, IV, V, and VII relate most directly to the goals of this project. The chapter titles are as follows:

I. Partnership for Excellence

II. Setting the Standards

III. Accelerating Students

IV. Preparing Teachers

V. Blends: Experiments in Transition

VI. Minorities: A Shared Mandate

VII. Special Models.

Recommendations (as paraphrased by Boyer), include the following:

1. High schools and colleges should join together to determine the content and specific skills considered essential requirements for entrance into college

2. Colleges and schools should work together to overcome the tyranny of time. Students should be free to move at their own pace, more flexibility to make the transition from school to college.

3. Programs for beginning teachers and for senior teachers should be collaboratively developed by colleges and schools.

4. Experimental transition schools should be established that combine the school/college years and avoid curricular overlap and duplication.

5. Collaboration is urgently required to identify disadvantaged students at an early age and provide constantly the help they require as they move from school to college.

6. Every college and university should establish a partnership with one or more school districts to provide educational and cultural enrichment as determined by principals and teachers at the schools.

There is a heavy emphasis in this report on the problems and issues surrounding articulation of students from schools to colleges. Maeroff's list of criteria for cooperative efforts between schools and colleges include the following;

1. A common agenda must be acknowledged.
2. A true spirit of collaboration must emerge.
3. A single project must be identified.
4. Those involved must be adequately rewarded.
5. The focus must be on activities, not machinery.

Miles, Mathew B. On Networking. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education (DHEW), School Capacity for Problem Solving Group, Network Development Division, March 1977. (ERIC No. ED 181 874)

This paper focuses on the theoretical and practical problems inherent in trying to build, create, develop, enhance, or strengthen networks among persons, groups, or organizations that would be useful in educational change efforts. Definitions are provided for the concepts of "social networks" and "networking," and background variables that might influence the potential success of networking efforts are examined. Approaches to networking that are evident in the literature, are discussed, as well as in

the case histories of deliberately created networks developed by Allen Parker and colleagues at the Center on Technology and Society. Tables are used to organize these observations by providing a taxonomy of networking "functions." The analysis concludes with a set of issues and unanswered questions about networking, and draws some general suggestions and implications for those in federal, state, or local settings who would like to understand networking for educational improvement more clearly and to practice it more successfully.

[The above annotation is quoted in major part from the abstract of ERIC Document # ED 181 874.]

Parker, L. Allen. Networks for Innovation and Problem Solving and Their Use for Improving Education: A Comparative Overview." Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education (DHEW), School Capacity for Problem Solving Group, Network Development Division, March 1977. (ERIC No. ED 181 873)

This paper synthesizes the findings and ideas gained from fifteen case histories of networks and major subnetworks, and interviewing leading participants in twelve additional networks. Most of the networks are devoted to improving education. The paper begins with a discussion of the elements essential to networks for innovation and problem solving; presents in the second section other network characteristics and their variations; and concludes by portraying a pattern of change that appears common, but not inevitable, among networks. Appendixes provide (1) a case history of the Federation for Unified Science Education, (2) a description of three computerized networks, (3) a bibliography of related literature, (4) a list

of the network case histories written, and (5) a list of the networking practitioners interviewed.

[The above annotation is quoted in major part from the Abstract of ERIC Document #ED 181 873.]

Parkay, Forrest W. "A School/University Partnership that Fosters Inquiry-Oriented Staff Development." Phi Delta Kappan, January 1986, 386-389.

Parkay organizes his discussion around the case-study of a staff-development program that utilized a school/university partnership to promote a thoughtful, inquiry-oriented dialogue on how to teach the basic skills most effectively. Two goals central to the program were: (1) to train teachers in methods based on recent research in teaching effectiveness, and (2) to develop a model program that could be used in other settings. The program was based on four assumptions about change:

1. Change must begin with an open, honest inquiry into how the teaching-learning process is currently conducted within a school.
2. Meaningful change must be seen as a process of gradual growth, the final form of which cannot be determined beforehand.
3. Change should begin and end with the professionally autonomous teacher; worthwhile change involves new relationships between teachers and students.
4. The likelihood of worthwhile change is greatest in a setting that fosters two-way, face-to-face communication.

Seven phases of the program are discussed in detail, and program results and teacher response to the program are reported.

Sarason, Seymore B.. Charles Carroll, Kenneth Maton, Saul Cohen, and Elizabeth Lorentz. Human Services and Resource Networks. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

In this work, Sarason et al. describe the deliberate formation and development of a network of individuals (referred to as the Essex network) that ultimately involved hundreds of people in several states. The network--made up of people from schools, colleges and universities, and public and private agencies--was formed for two major purposes: (1) to exchange resources on a barter-economy basis for mutual benefit to the parties, and (2) to form a psychological sense of community.

Chapters of the book involve discussions of: the rationale and development of the essex Network, the roles and influence of the primary actors, network meetings, how to deal with rapid growth, and leadership and funding. A review of the literature is presented in two chapters toward the end of the work.

Trubowitz, Sidney, Johanna Duncan, William Fibkins, Paul Longo, and Seymour Sarason. When a College Works with a Public School: A Case Study of School-College Collaboration. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1984.

The Queens College/Louis Armstrong Middle School Collaboration is the focus of this account of a cooperative venture involving a school, a college, a public school district, and a community. Written in the first person, the work is an insightful recounting of the development of the collaboration from its inception through the early years of its existence.

Each author brings to the discussion a unique role orientation, which lends a richness to the description of the project's chronology, evolving structure, the functions of and the relationships between personnel members, the points of success, and the points of failure. The report is context inclusive, which gives the reader a feeling for the complexities intrinsic to an enterprise of this nature. Throughout the work, the interplay between theory and practice is recognized and discussed. Problems and limitations are dealt with candidly. The differences in value systems between the college and the public school come up as a theme repeatedly, as well as the frustrations of dealing with the political machinery of a large urban school district. The last chapter describes the development of a second collaboration with the college, this time with an elementary school. The report is analytical as well as descriptive, and is replete with appendixes that give exemplars of interviews conducted by Dr. Sarason.

Wilbur, Franklin P. "School-College Partnerships: Building Effective Models for Collaboration. NASSP Bulletin, October 1984, pp. 34-49.

Since 1981, a variety of associations, institutes, and commissions have issued reports describing the condition of our schools and their general failure to produce satisfactory results for a large portion of their charges. However, with the rising tide of expectations, indictments, and recommendations for necessary changes and improvements, there is seldom a corresponding flood of new resources and other needed types of assistance

to tackle major reform. With increasing budgetary constraints on federal and state government, Wilbur contends that "Our system of education must examine as creatively as possible, ways it can help itself." He argues that "our schools and colleges may be their own best resources."

Wilbur acknowledges that there are numerous arguments against collaboration, but points out that such arguments are circular; the current barriers to collaboration have been brought about because of negative attitudes toward such ventures in the first place.

Several successful school/college collaborations are discussed, with attention being paid to the context in which collaboration developed and the unique focuses and thrusts of the various enterprises. Wilbur concludes with a list of principles of collaboration that seem critical to the success of any school/college partnership.

Wiles, Marilyn M. and Jan Branch. "University-Public School Collaboration Models in Teacher Education." The Educational Forum, November 1979, pp. 35-43.

Preservice and inservice teacher education has traditionally been approached as two separate programs--preservice falling in the domain of the universities, and inservice under the auspices of the school districts. Recently, however, several forces have emerged that collectively have been pressing both universities and school districts to change teacher preparation programs. The purposes of this article, as stated by the authors, are:

(1) to characterize the nature of the press on both universities and school districts to collaborate in teacher preparation;

(2) to describe four models illustrative of how universities and school districts appear to be adjusting to explicit and implicit presses for collaboration; and

(3) to draw implications for universities and school districts approaching collaboration in teacher education programs.

Wiles and Branch contend that the field-based experience for preservice teachers has been a "chance proposition," and that "inservice teacher education usually has been a haphazard effort to justify salary increase . . . or justify district concern." Problems that have arisen in preservice and inservice teacher education are discussed, and explicit and implicit forces that press for collaboration between districts and universities are listed. Four collaborative models that represent various degrees of adaptation to demands for collaboration are described. These are: (1) Time Allocation Expansion Model, (2) Collaboration Model, (3) Joint Governance Model, (4) Consortium Center Model. The strengths and weaknesses of each model are highlighted and the implications of collaborative relationships between school districts and universities in the area of teacher education are discussed.

APPENDIX B

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aiken, W. M. The Story of the Eight-Year Study, vol. 1 of Adventure in American Education. Progressive Education Association, Commission on the Relation of School and College. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

Allen, T. J. "The Role of Person to Person Communication Networks in the Dissemination of Industrial Technology." Washington, D.C.: NIE, 1977.

Ambach, G. "The High School/College Connection: A State Perspective." Change, Jan/Feb. 1982, pp. 22-25.

Anderson, R. A. Personal interview, 25 April 1966.

Andrews, R. L. and R. Soder. "University/District Collaboration on Effective Schools." National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision 2, No. 3 (1985-86): 33-48.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. "Special Report on Networks." ASCD Update 28, No. 4 (June 1986).

Bach, M. and Ray Thornton. "Academic-Industrial Partnerships in Biomedical Research: Inevitability and Desirability." Educational Record, Spring 1983.

Baker, E. L. "Can Educational Research Inform Educational Practice? Yes!" Phi Delta Kappan, March 1984, pp. 453-455.

Barnes, J. Social Networks. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1972.

Berger, P. and R. Neuhaus. To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1977.

Berliner, D. C. "Making the Right Changes in Teacher Education." Phi Delta Kappan, October 1984, pp. 94-96.

Berman, P. and M. McLaughin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, vol 8. "Implementing and Sustaining Innovations." Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 1978.

Boiko, S. "Catalyst for Improvement of Education." The Journal of College Admissions, Summer 1985, pp. 9-11.

Boissevain, J. Friends of Friends: Networks, Manipulators and Coalitions. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973.

Botel, M., A. Glatthorn, and J. Larkin. "Focused Graduate Studies: A New Pattern of School/University Cooperation." Phi Delta Kappan, April 1984.

Brandt, R. "On Teacher Career Development: A Conversation with Phillip Schlechty." Educational Leadership, November 1985, pp. 20-22.

Brandt, R. S. "On Improving Achievement of Minority Children: A Conversation with James Comer." Educational Leadership, February 1986, pp. 13-17.

Bryan, N. "Educational Renewal." The Peabody Reflector, Summer 1985, pp. 14-16 & 36.

Clark, E. D. "A Conceptual Basis for Collaboration." Emerging Concepts for Collaboration, Bulletin # 40. Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1975, pp. 1-17.

Clark, R. "The Logical Link Between Career Ladders and Teacher Education." Educational Leadership, November 1985, pp. 77-81.

Cohen, S. (ed.). Education in the United States: A Documentary History. New York: Random House, 1974.

Comer, J. School Power: Implications of an Intervention Program. New York: The Free Press, 1980.

Comer, J. "Toward School Improvement: A Study of Collaborative Relationships Between Universities and Public Schools." Final report to National Institute of Education (NIE-G-80-0044), 1981.

Comer, J. P. "Demand for Excellence and the Need for Equity: The Dynamics of Collaboration." In Education in School and Nonschool Settings, Eighty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I., edited by M. D. Fantini and R. L. Sinclair. Chicago: NSSE, 1985.

Curry, L. "Teacher Centers as University/District Collaboratives." Phi Delta Kappan, May 1980.

Curtis, D. K. and L. O. Andrews. Guiding Your Student Teacher. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

Dalin, P. "Network for Educational Change." Washington, D.C.: NIE, 1977.

Danzberger, J. P. and M. D. Usdan. "Building Partnerships: The Atlanta Experience." Phi Delta Kappan, February 1984, pp. 393-396.

Davies, H. D. and J. T. Aquino. "Collaboration in Continuing Professional Development." Journal of Teacher Education 26, No. 3 (Fall 1985): 274-277.

De Bevoise, W. "Collaboration: Some Principles of Bridgework." Educational Leadership, February 1986, pp. 9-12.

Dempsey, E. "Impact II: A Teacher-to-Teacher Networking Program." Educational Leadership, December 1984-January 1985, pp. 4143.

Devaney, K. Networking on Purpose: A Reflection Study of the Teachers' Center Exchange. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and development, 1982.

Dewey, B. and M. Merklin. "The Commonwealth Partnership." Journal of College Admissionism, Summer 1985, pp. 12-14.

Duckett, W. "People in Educational Evaluation and Research: An Interview with William Cooley. Improving the Public Schools Through Decision-Oriented Research." Phi Delta Kappan, February 1986, pp. 462-466.

Eisner, E. W. "Can Educational Research Inform Educational Practice?" Phi Delta Kappan, March 1984, pp. 447-452.

Fuess, C. M. The College Board: Its First Fifty Years. New York: University Press, 1950.

Gallant, M. G. More Fun With Dick and Jane. New York: Penguin Books, 1986.

Gehrke, N. J. and W. C. Parker. "Collaboration in Staff Development: Variations on the Concept." NASSP Bulletin 67, No. 461 (March 1983): 50-54.

Goodlad, J. I. "The Reconstruction of Teacher Education." Teachers College Record 72, No. 1 (September 1970).

Goodlad, J. I. The Dynamics of Educational Change: Toward Responsive Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Goodlad, J. I. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Goodlad, J. I. "Summary: Work Conference on School/University Partnerships, Chicago, August 2, 1985." Unpublished manuscript, University of Washington, 1985a.

Goodlad, J. I. "Reconstructing Schooling and the Education of Educators: The Partnership Concept." Unpublished manuscript, University of Washington, 1985b.

Goodlad, J. I. "Toward a More Perfect Union." State Education Leadership. Denver: Education Commission of the States, May 1986.

Gray, S. T. "How to Create a Successful School/Community Partnership." Phi Delta Kappan, February 1984, pp. 405-409.

Haberman, M. "Twenty-Three Reasons Why Universities Can't Educate Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education 22 (1971): 133-140.

Harper, William R. The Trend in Higher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985, p. 389.

Hathaway, W. E. "Models of School-University Collaboration: National and Local Perspectives on Collaborations That Work." Paper presented for Symposium at the Annual Meeting of AERA, Chicago, March 1985. (ED 253 973).

Havelock, R. G. The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Education Technology Publications, 1973.

Havelock, R. G. "School-University Collaboration Supporting School Improvement." The Eastern Private University Network Case, vol. 3, Washington, D.C.: NIE, Research and Practice Program, 1981.

Havelock, R., M. Huberman, N. Levinson, and P. Coz. "School-University Collaboration Supporting School Improvement." Cross-site Analysis, vol. 3. Washington, D.C.: American University, Knowledge Transfer Institute, 1982. (NIE Contract No. 400-79-0063)

Hechinger, F. M. "School-College Collaboration: An Essential to Improved Public Education." NASSP Bulletin, October 1984, pp. 69-79.

Holt, L. and K. Peterson. "University and Public School Cooperation for Professional Growth." Action in Teacher Education 3, No. 1 (Winter/Spring 1981): 65-75.

Hord, S. M. "A Synthesis of Research on Organizational Collaboration." Educational Leadership, February 1986, pp. 22-26.

Huberman, M. "School-University Collaboration Supporting School Improvement." The Midwestern State Case, vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: American University, Knowledge Transfer Institute, 1981. (NIE Contract No. 400-79-0063)

Huberman, M. "Making Changes From Exchanges: Some Frameworks for Studying the Teachers' Centers Exchange." In Networking on Purpose, edited by K. Devaney. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory, 1982.

Huberman, M. and M. Miles. "How School Improvement Works: A Multiple-Site Field Study." In A Study of Dissemination Efforts in Supporting School Improvement, vol. 3, edited by D. Crandall et al. Andover, Mass.: The Network, 1982.

Huberman, M., N. Levinson, P. Havelock, and P. Cox. "Interorganizational Arrangements: An Approach to Educational Practice Improvement." Knowledge 3, No. 1 (1981): 5-22.

Hymel, G. M. "A Model for Facilitating LEA/University Cooperative Efforts." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of AERA, Boston, 1980. (ED 184 927)

Joyce, B. R., R. H. Hersh, and M. McKibbin. The Structure of School Improvement. New York: Longman, 1983.

Justiz, M. J. and W. S. Mason. "A Changing NIE: Facilitating New Partnerships." Phi Delta Kappan, December 1984, pp. 277-280.

Katz, E. and P. F. Lazarsfeld. Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communications. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.

Kelly, J. Looking Back, Moving Ahead: A Decade of School Finance Reform. New York: Ford Foundation, 1980.

Kinzer, S. M. and W. H. Drummond. "Parity and Educational Problem Solving: A Progress Report." Emerging Concepts for Collaboration, Bulletin # 40, Association of Teacher Educators, Washington, D.C., 1975, pp. 19-28.

Kirst, M. "A Tale of Two Networks: The School Finance Reform versus the Spending and Tax Limitations Lobby." Taxing & Spending 3 (1980): 43-49.

Kormondy, E. J. and B. E. Essenfeld. Addison-Wesley Biology. Menlo Park, Calif.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1984.

Ladd, E. T. "Tensions in School-University Collaboration." Partnership in Teacher Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and The Association for Student Teaching, Washington, D.C., 1966.

Lareau, A. and C. Benson. "The Economics of Home/School Relationships: A Cautionary Note." Phi Delta Kappan, February 1984, pp. 401-404.

Lieberman, A. "Collaborative Research: Working With, Not Working On. . ." Educational Leadership, February 1986a, pp. 28-32.

Lieberman, A. "Collaborative Work." Educational Leadership, February 1986b, pp. 4-8.

Lortie, D. C. Networks and Organizational Rationality in American Public Schools. Washington, D.C.: NIE, 1977.

LSCE Staff. "Linking Educational Theory and School Practice: The Laboratory in School and Community Education." Occasional Paper No. 1, University of California, Graduate School of Education, 1985.

Maeroff, G. I. School and College Partnerships in Education. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983.

Mahlios, M. C. and R. L. Carpenter. "Political Economy As A Conceptual Framework For the Analysis of School-University Cooperation." Education 103, No. 1 (Fall 1982): 15-21.

Marburger, C. L. One School at a Time: School Based Management, a Process for Change. Columbia, Md.: The Network Committee for Citizens in Education, 1985.

Miles, M. On Networking. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Education, Group on School Capacity for Problem-Solving, 1977.

Miles, M. B. and D. G . Lake. "Communications Networks in the Designing and Starting of New Schools." Paper presented at the 60th Annual Meeting of the AERA, Washington, D.C., March 1975.

Moreno, J. L. Who Shall Survive: Foundation of Sociometry, Group Psychotherapy and Sociodrama. Washington, D.C.: Nervous and Mental Disease Monograph 58, 1934; New York: Beacon House, republished in 1953.

National Committe For Citizens in Education. The Network. Columbia, Maryland: The Committee, December-January 1986.

National Science Board. "University-Industry Research Relationships: Myths, Realities and Potentials." Fourteenth Annual Report of the National Science Board, NSB 82-1, October 1982.

Norris, C. A., S. L. Starrfield, and L. K. Hartwell. "Old Adversaries United: Benefits of Collaborative Research." NASSP Bulletin, April 1984, pp. 143-147.

Nur, M. M. "University-District Collaboration for Promoting Change in Curriculum and Classroom Practices." Theory Into Practice 22, No. 3 (Summer 1983): 224-230.

Parkay, F. W. "A School/University Partnership That Fosters Inquiry-Oriented Staff Development." Phi Delta Kappan, January 1986, pp. 386-389.

Parker, L. A. "Interactive Networks for Champions of Innovations." Doctoral dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1971.

Parker, L. Networks for Innovation and Problem-Solving and their Use for Improving Education: A Comparative Overview. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, Group on School Capacity for Problem-Solving, 1977.

Parker, L. and M. Hedin. Networking as a Change Strategy. Cambridge, Mass.: Center on Technology and Society, 1982.

Peterson, P. E. Schools, Groups and Networks: A Political Perspective, rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: NIE, 1977.

Peterson, P. E. The Politics of School Reform 1870-1940. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Roberts, A. D. "The ASCD High School Network: Impressions From on the Road." Educational Leadership, March 1984, pp. 44-47.

Roberts, H. AASCU Surveys School/College Cooperative Programs. AASCU Special Report. Washington, D.C.: AASCU, January 1985. (ED 257 797).

Rogers, E. M., and F. F. Shoemaker. Communications of Innovations: A Cross Cultural Approach, 2nd ed. New York: Free Press, 1971.

Sarason, S. B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change, 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982.

Sarason, S. et al. Human Services and Resource Networks. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Schaefer, R. The School as the Center of Inquiry. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Schmuck, P. A. "Networking: A New Word, A Different Game." Educational Leadership 43, No. 5 (February 1986): 60-61.

Schon, D. A. Network-Related Intervention. Washington, D.C.: NIE, 1977.

Seeley, D. S. Education Through Partnership: Mediating Structures and Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1981.

Seeley, D. "Educational Partnership and the Dilemmas of School Reform." Phi Delta Kappan, February 1984.

Shive, R. J. "School and University Partnerships: Meeting Common Needs." Improving College and University Teaching 32, No. 3 (Summer 1984): 119-122.

Sirotnik, K. "The Partnership." Unpublished manuscript, University of Washington, Seattle, 1985.

Smith, E. B., and J. I. Goodlad. "Promises and Pitfalls in the Trend Toward Collaboration." Partnership in Teacher Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and The Association for Student Teaching, Washington, D.C., 1966.

Smith, L. M. Interorganizational Structures as Educational Networks. Washington, D.C.: NIE, 1977.

Smith, W. "A Study of Administrators' Communication Networks in a Public School District." Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1983.

Tatel, D. and R. Guthrie. "The Legal Ins and Outs of University-Industry Collaboration." Educational Record, Spring 1983.

Thompson, J. D. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Tichy, N. and C. Fombrun. "Network Analysis In Organizational Settings." Human Relations 32, No. 2 (1979).

Tolsdorf, C. "Social Networks and the Coping Process." Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts, 1975.

Trubowitz, S. "Stages in the Developmenet of School-College Collaboration." Educational Leadership, February 1986, pp 18-21.

Trubowitz, S., J. Duncan, W. Fibkins, P. Longo, and S. Sarason. When a College Works with a Public School: A Case Study of School College Collaboration. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1984.

Trueblood, C. and K. Flanagan. "University/School District Staff Development: A Collaborative Effort." Wingspan, January 1983.

Turk, H. "Interorganizational Networks in Urban Society: Initial Perspectives and Comparative Research." American Journal of Sociology 71 (1966): 430-438.

Turk, H. "Interorganizational Networks in Urban Society: Initial Perspectives and Comparative Research." American Sociological Review 35, No. 1 (1970): 1-19.

Tyack D. and E. Hansot. Managers of Virtue. New York: Basic Books, 1982.

Walberg, H. J. "Families as Partners in Educational Productivity." Phi Delta Kappan, February 1984, pp. 397-400.

Walsh, E., ed. "Stanford, Schools Reap Benefits of Working Together." Stanford School of Education, suppplement to Stanford Observer, January 1986.

Wilbur, F. P. "School-College Partnerships: Building Effective Models for Collaboration." NASSP Bulletin, October 1984, pp. 34-49.

Wilbur, F. "School-College Partnerships." Journal of College Admissions, Summer 1985, pp. 20-28.

Wiles, M. and J. Branch. "University-Public School Collaboration Models in Teacher Education." The Educational Forum, November 1979, pp. 35-43.

Willer, D. and B. Anderson. Networks, Exchange and Coercion. New York: Elsevier, 1981.

Wu, P. C. "School Districts and Universities and Staff Development: Is it a Mixture That Will Work?" Paper presented at the National Staff Development Council Conference, Denver, December 1985.